

OCT 24 1973

JUDAISM

AMBASSADOR COLLEGE LIBRARY
Pasadena, California

JEWS AS POLITICAL LEADERS

Robert Gordis

S. M. Ginsburg

THE NEW CONSERVATIVE PRAYER BOOK

Levi A. Olan

Steven Riskin

Leonard Levin

Sidney Greenberg

THE RABBINATE—YESTERDAY AND TODAY

Arthur A. Chiel

Viviana A. and Gerald L. Zelizer

SUE No. 88 / VOLUME 22 / NUMBER 4 / \$2.25

FALL 1973

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STATEMENT OF SPONSORSHIP

The American Jewish Congress is sponsoring the publication of JUDAISM: A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF JEWISH LIFE AND THOUGHT as part of its basic policy "to stimulate an informed awareness of Jewish affairs, encourage Jewish scholarship and adequate opportunities for Jewish education, and generally foster the affirmation of Jewish religious, cultural, and historic identity."

JUDAISM, conceived as a free and non-partisan organ, is dedicated to the creative discussion and exposition of the religious, moral and philosophical concepts of Judaism and their relevance to the problems of modern society. Through an exploration of the meaning and needs of the Jewish experience, it hopes to widen the channels of communication between Jews and to affirm Jewish verity and vitality to the world at large.

The Board of Editors, composed of distinguished scholars and thinkers drawn from every segment of Jewish life, is vested with full authority and responsibility for the contents of this Journal. Views and opinions expressed in the articles and reviews are those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the American Jewish Congress, which is sponsoring the publication of this Journal as a service to the American Jewish community and to all who seek to understand the nature of the Jewish tradition and its modern significance.

American Jewish Congress

JUDAISM: A QUARTERLY JOURNAL is published by the American Jewish Congress. It appears in January, April, July, and October. Office of Publication: 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028. Re-entered as second-class matter at Post Office, New York City, N.Y. Subscription in the United States and Canada, \$8.00 for one year, \$14.00 for two years, \$19.00 for three years; foreign subscription, \$9.00. Special rate for bulk (10 or more) and student subscriptions, \$5.00. Single issue, \$2.25; single issue abroad, \$2.50. Make checks payable to the order of JUDAISM, and send to: 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028. A month's notice must be given of any change of address.

US ISSN 0022-5762

The Board of Editors invites articles, communications, comments and discussion for publication. Address: Editors, JUDAISM, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028. Copyright © 1973 by the American Jewish Congress.

JUDAISM

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

Issue 88 / Volume 22 / Number 4 / Fall 1973

<i>The First Reader</i>	R.G.	387
<i>From Adam's Serpent to Abraham's Ram</i>	CHAIM LEWIS	392
<i>An Encounter with the "Akedah"</i>	ROBERT J. MILCH	397
<i>Jews as Political Figures—A Footnote to Diaspora History</i>	ROBERT GORDIS	400
<i>Peter Shafiroff—"Jewish" Adviser to Peter the Great</i> (Translation by Claire B. Shapiro)	SAUL M. GINSBURG	409

THE NEW CONSERVATIVE PRAYER BOOK

<i>A New Prayer Book—Conservative Judaism Defines Itself</i>	LEVI A. OLAN	418
<i>"Modern" Prayer—At What Sacrifice?</i>	STEVEN RISKIN	426
<i>Whither Conservative Liturgy?</i>	LEONARD LEVIN	433
<i>Reactions to the Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor</i>	SIDNEY GREENBERG	440
<i>The Enjoyment of Scripture: An Esthetic Approach</i>	SAMUEL SANDMEL	455
<i>Jewish Militarism and Jewish Survival</i>	JOSEPH SCHULTZ	468
<i>Rosenzweig on Judaism and Christianity—The Two Covenant Approach</i>	MAURICE G. BOWLER	475
<i>The Mystery of the Rabbi's Lost Portrait</i>	ARTHUR A. CHIEL	482
<i>The Conservative Rabbinate—In Quest of Professionalism</i>	VIVIANA A. and GERALD L. ZELIZER	490

REVIEWS

<i>Review-Essay: In Praise of Reason Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism</i> by Hermann Cohen	TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN	498
<i>Masot V'mehkarim</i> by Hayyim Ze'ev Reines	ISAAC KLEIN	504
<i>Jewish Folkways in Germanic Lands</i> by Herman Pollack	GERALD ENGEL	505

INDEX to Volume 22	510
--------------------	-----

Editor

ROBERT GORDIS

Managing Editor

RUTH B. WAXMAN

Contributing Editors

JACOB B. AGUS, Baltimore, Md. • SELIG ADLER, Buffalo, N.Y. • ALEXANDER ALTMANN, Waltham, Mass. • MAX ARZT, New York, N.Y. • SALO W. BARON, New York, N.Y. • MEIR BEN-HORIN, Philadelphia, Pa. • HUGO BERGMAN, Jerusalem, Israel • BEN ZION BOKSER, New York, N.Y. • EUGENE B. BOROWITZ, New York, N.Y. • WILLIAM G. BRAUDE, Providence, R.I. • ARTHUR A. COHEN, New York, N.Y. • GERSON D. COHEN, New York, N.Y. • EMIL L. FACKENHEIM, Toronto, Canada • DAVID FLUSSER, Jerusalem, Israel • MARVIN FOX, Columbus, O. • SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, Pittsburgh, Pa. • MAURICE FRIEDMAN, Philadelphia, Pa. • THEODORE FRIEDMAN, Jerusalem, Israel • NAHUM N. GLATZER, Waltham, Mass. • JUDAH GOLDIN, New Haven, Conn. • ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, Jerusalem, Israel • MAX GRUENEWALD, Millburn, N.J. • MENAHEM HARAN, Jerusalem, Israel • WILL HERBERG, Madison, N.J. • ARTHUR HYMAN, New York, N.Y. • ERICH ISAAC, Irvington, N.Y. • MAX KADUSHIN, New York, N.Y. • HORACE M. KALLEN, New York, N.Y. • MORDECAI M. KAPLAN, New York, N.Y. • MILTON R. KONVITZ, Ithaca, N.Y. • ARTHUR J. LELYVELD, Cleveland, Ohio • SOL LIPTZIN, Jerusalem, Israel • LEVI A. OLAN, Dallas, Texas • HARRY M. ORLINSKY, New York, N.Y. • JAKOB PETUCHOWSKI, Cincinnati, O. • LEO PFEFFER, New York, N.Y. • JOACHIM PRINZ, Newark, N.J. • EMANUEL RACKMAN, New York, N.Y. • NATHAN ROTENSTREICH, Jerusalem, Israel • ZALMAN M. SCHACHTER, Winnipeg, Canada • DAVID S. SHAPIRO, Milwaukee, Wis. • DAVID WOLF SILVERMAN, New York, N.Y. • ERNST SIMON, Jerusalem, Israel • AARON STEINBERG, London, England • SHEMARYAHU TALMON, Jerusalem, Israel • SINAI UCKO, Herzliyah, Israel • DAVID WEISS, New York, N.Y. • PAUL WEISS, New Haven, Conn. • TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN, New York, N.Y. • HARRY A. WOLFSON, Cambridge, Mass. • MICHAEL WYSCHOGROD, New York, N.Y.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

In increasing measure, modern men are turning again to the quest for a world-view on the issues that are timeless—the meaning of life, the challenge of death, the purpose of suffering, the significance of the individual, his relation to society, and the goal of history. In order to advance this enterprise of spiritual discovery of our time this Journal has been projected. It will be primarily concerned with the philosophy, ethics, and religion of Judaism as a factor in the contemporary world . . .

We are committed to the proposition that Judaism has positive value today for Jews and for the world . . . At the same time, we disassociate ourselves from the dangerous tendency toward the hardening of party lines on the contemporary Jewish scene . . . The members of the Board of Editors belong to every school of Jewish life or to none. The trends popularly referred to as Orthodox, Conservatism, Reform, Reconstructionism, as well as others that as yet have no specific names, have their advocates among us, though no institution or movement is officially represented . . . Undoubtedly, our differences will find expression in these pages, but we shall be at one in opposing the dogmatism which takes for granted that one's own particular standpoint has a monopoly on truth and the authoritarianism which would suppress any contrary point of view.

Judaism will be dedicated to the quest for truth in the spirit of freedom. Our columns will be open to anyone who has something significant to say and the ability to say it well. New and unconventional interpretations, whatever their standpoint, will be welcomed from every source, for we share the conviction of the Talmud that "Both these and the others are the words of the living God."—*From the introductory article by Robert Gordis, "Toward a Renaissance of Judaism" in Vol. I, No. 1.*

The First Reader

THE TALMUD SAGELY INFORMS US "THE TORAH may be interpreted in an infinite number of ways," using the number forty-nine or seven times seven to drive the point home. No incident in the Bible has sustained so much varied interpretation as the *Akedah* the narrative of the Binding of Isaac (Genesis, chapter 22). The only possible exception would be the opening chapters in Genesis depicting the fall of Adam, which plays so fundamental a role in classic Christian theology. Indeed, the *Akedah* seems to occupy an almost equally important position in Jewish thought, in part, perhaps, because it serves as a counterfoil to the Christian doctrine of Jesus' sacrifice on the cross.

One of the most famous reinterpretations of the incident of the sacrifice of Isaac is that of Kierkegaard, which he uses to buttress his concept of "the teleological suspension of the ethical." I may add, parenthetically, that there are convincing grounds for regarding his interpretation of the *Akedah* as basically contradictory to Biblical thought, and the doctrine he derives from it as totally mistaken, notwithstanding current theological fashions to the contrary.

Chaim Lewis, in his paper "From Adam's Serpent to Abraham's Ram," offers a new and moving interpretation of the *Akedah*, which he associates with the "Adam and Eve" narrative. I believe our readers will find his paper a rewarding experience.

A totally different interpretation of the *Akedah* is offered by *Robert J. Milch* in his paper, "An Encounter with the *Akedah*," in which the approaches Kierkegaard's standpoint. The author maintains that there is no apparent reason for God's command to Abraham to sacrifice his son, and that the purpose of the incident is to teach that man is not perfect and cannot fathom the will of God.

Historians have long differed as to the dates to be assigned to the modern age. The various suggestions for the beginning of the modern era include the capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, the Renaissance in Italy, the voyages of exploration in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Protestant Reformation, and the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Perhaps the most widely accepted date for the inception of the modern age is the French Revolution in 1789.

In the case of Jewish history, the question is further complicated by the fact that the emergence of the Jew from the ghetto was a slow, halting and incomplete process, coming at different times in different countries and varying in character and motivation. In Central and Western Europe, the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century undermined the authority of the Jewish tradition for many Jews. The Emancipation, which followed in the wake of the legions of Napoleon, breached the ghetto walls and destroyed the autonomy of the Jewish community. It offered the individual Jew political citizenship, civic equality and the opportunities for material and intellectual achievement. In exchange, he was expected to surrender his adherence to the Jewish community and his obedience to its authority. As for the vast majority of Jews who were concentrated in Eastern Europe, largely under the suzerainty of the Czars, they continued to live under medieval conditions virtually until the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, one must avoid a simplistic concept of the status of Russian and Polish Jewry. Though the winds of modernism, with its opportunities and its temptations, which Western Jews encountered after the Emancipation, were not known in Eastern Europe, individual Jews in the East, often the most ambitious and gifted members of the community, found it possible to identify with the majority to achieve notable personal success in literature and the arts, in commerce and industry, and even in government. To be sure, the greater degree of intolerance that was characteristic of the East meant that there was a higher price for the ambitious Jew to pay. Frequently he had to be willing to undergo a total rejection of Judaism and a complete severance of any relationship with the Jewish community. Conversion was generally the name of the game.

The gifted Russian-Jewish historian, Saul M. Ginsburg, devoted a fascinating volume, *Meshumadim in Tsarishen Rusland*, to a study of Jewish converts to Christianity in Tsarist Russia. While it is true that Russian Jews lagged far behind their Western brothers in achieving political rights, it may come as a surprise to note that a converted Jew became an important political figure as early as the reign of Peter the Great in Russia, long before there were any counterparts in the West.

Actually, the phenomenon of Jews attaining important political positions in the general community is as old as the Bible. Nevertheless, it has not been adequately observed and evaluated. It is the theme of the paper by *Robert Gordis*, "Jews as Political Figures." This essay may serve as an introduction to "Peter Shafiroff—a Jewish Advisor to Peter the Great," which is a revised and abridged translation by *Claire Shapiro* of the opening chapter in Ginsburg's book. Though virtually nothing is known of Shafiroff's sentiments on Jews and Judaism, he serves as a prototype of the Jew in politics in the modern era.

The High Holy Days mark the high water mark of religious experience for most contemporary Jews. The appearance of a Maḥzor for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, the first published under the official auspices of the Rabbinical Assembly, is, therefore, of more than limited significance. We are, therefore, devoting a substantial section of this fall issue of JUDAISM, which appears at the High Holy Day season, to a discussion from various points of view of the contents and significance of this prayer book. *Levi A. Olan*, a distinguished Reform rabbi and theologian, who sets forth the problems confronting religion, in general, and prayer, in particular, in a secular age, expresses warm appreciation for the extent to which this prayer book is conscious of the problem which affects all movements in Judaism and seeks to meet that challenge. *Steven Riskin*, one of the outstanding younger members of the Orthodox rabbinate, while paying tribute to its virtues, takes exception to some of the omissions from the traditional ritual, notably the elimination of the *Avodah*, the description of the sacrifices which he regards as significant for contemporary Judaism. *Leonard Levin* offers a critique of the new Maḥzor, which he regards as revealing the symptoms of spiritual malaise in Jewish religious life today. *Sydney Greenberg*, a well-known Conservative rabbi, who has written extensively in the field of liturgy, analyzes the achievements and the shortcomings of the prayer book from the perspective of the movement itself. This symposium should help focus attention on what has always been regarded as central to a vital faith—the experience of prayer, both individual and collective.

The problem of transliterating Hebrew into English, especially for various purposes, is probably insoluble. This will explain the variations that the reader will encounter in this symposium on the Maḥzor.)

If one were to maintain that "Judaism is fun," one would probably be put down as an egregious example of "the vulgar American." The truth is, however, that, aside from the particular vocabulary employed, there is good warrant for this approval in the tradition. Various passages in the Bible describe the observance of the Sabbath and the study of the Torah as "a delight." The Prayer Book declares, "Happy are we, how good our portion, how pleasant our lot, how beautiful our heritage!" The entire concept of *Torah lishmah*, "the study of the Torah for its own sake," anticipated by centuries the observation of a modern mathematician that there is no greater joy than thinking God's thoughts after Him. Moreover, it was an experience open to every Jew. In emphasizing joy as a cardinal mizvah, Hasidism was building on Rabbinic teaching, which always stressed that Judaism be enjoyed.

A highly important aspect of this commandment, which has all too

often been lost sight of, is presented by *Samuel Sandmel* in his paper, "The Enjoyment of Scripture."

It has been said that the only thing men learn from history is that men learn nothing from history. In spite of this wry observation, there is an inveterate human tendency to invoke the history of the past in order to buttress positions in the present. The Nazi Holocaust and the heroic, though lesser, aspect of the Jewish Resistance have focused attention upon Jewish resistance movements in the past, for which one must go back many centuries to the Roman period. Nineteen centuries ago the embattled Jewish people raised the banner of revolt against the mighty Roman Empire no less than three times in sixty years. *Joseph Schultz* surveys this era in Jewish history and argues that there is a direct cause-and-effect relationship between "Jewish Militancy and Jewish Survival."

Ever since Franz Rosenzweig's tragic and untimely death in 1929 at the age of forty-four, his name has been one to conjure with. He has been universally admired for his fruitful literary career, his religious sensitivity, his moral integrity, and, above all, the profoundly moving heroism of his brief, pain-wracked life. His major work, *Stern der Erlösung*, commanded the attention of theologians, both in Judaism and Christianity, but it was read substantially less than his other, briefer writings. During the last decades, interest in his thought has been mounting steadily, stimulated by the recent translation of his great book both into English and Hebrew. To speak in editorial fashion, a growing number of contributions dealing with Franz Rosenzweig come across our desk.

One of the most original—and controversial—aspects of Rosenzweig's thought has been his "two covenant theory" which seeks to establish a basis for legitimacy and permanence both for Judaism and for Christianity. Hailed by many Christian thinkers, it has been severely criticized by several Jewish theologians as conceding an undue measure of legitimacy to the claims of Christianity.

Maurice G. Bowler, in his paper, "Rosenzweig on Judaism and Christianity—the Two Covenant Theory," surveys the various reactions to this basic element of Rosenzweig's thought. He suggests that many of the criticisms leveled against it miss the mark because they approach it from an exclusively theological perspective. The author maintains that Rosenzweig's theory must be seen against the background of his time and interpreted as an expression of "his passion for Jewish survival." In other words, "the two covenant theory" is not so much an effort to

accommodate Christianity in the Jewish world view as an attempt to establish a *locus standi* for Judaism in a Christian world.

This conclusion is, of course, quite distinct from the question of the success or failure, the validity or the weakness of Rosenzweig's theory.

The central position of the rabbi in the spectrum of American Jewish life is no modern phenomenon. Whether one greets the fact with joy or with regret—and there are grounds for both emotions—the rabbi has served as the visible and living embodiment of Judaism on the American scene, even when the seats of power are occupied by others. One of the earliest exemplars of the rabbinical calling on American soil was Rabbi Chaim Isaac Carigal, who is the subject of a lively paper by *Arthur A. Chiel*, entitled “The Mystery of the Rabbi's Lost Portrait.”

Separated by over three centuries from him is the contemporary American rabbi, whose career has undergone radical transformation during this period and gives every promise of undergoing even more radical change in the future. The problems of the rabbi should be of concern to anyone genuinely interested in the quality of Jewish life.

Viviana and *Gerald Lee Zelizer*, in their paper, “The Conservative Rabbinate—In Quest of Professionalism,” make a strong plea for the overt recognition of the professional character of the rabbinate today. Their observations and contentions, which are sure to arouse warm discussion, apply with equal force to all groups in American Judaism.

R. G.

From Adam's Serpent to Abraham's Ram

CHAIM LEWIS

LIKE FOR ALL HEDER BOYS, MY FIRST ENTRANCE into the heavenly Hebrew of the Bible was through the story of the binding of Isaac—the *akedah*. As a child, this awesome tale lost none of its compelling power for me, despite the laborious verse-by-verse rote learning, with the familiar soft-footed English riding, as it were, in tandem with the muscular, purposeful Hebrew.

The tale, as I remember, alarmed; I was sorely puzzled by this “testing” of Abraham. What kind of God was this, wagging, as it were, a magisterial finger at Abraham, his all too docile pupil, with Isaac cast in the role of innocent victim? Who was this fleet-footed ram, by fate appointed, sniffing the scent of destiny at day's dawning on Mount Moriah, finding itself caught in the thicket by the pride of its horns to meet its moment in time at Abraham's hands?

For all the story's happy ending, I refused to recognize a triumph of faith in Abraham's steadfastness, or the wisdom in a God so intent on cruel sacrificial love, or His mercy in the sparing of Isaac. Nor could I discover any sense or purpose with the uncomfortable feeling that this tale belonged to neither time nor place. I saw in it the menace of haunting presence knifing the dark in some strange ritual of death. It belonged to the night-world of dream.

What haunted the puzzled child has lost none of its mystery over the years. It still haunts, still sets the mind probing for meaning. Time has certainly added its own stirring resonances; the experience of life has helped to explore the hurt of it, if not the reason for it. The *akedah* has become part of the mythology of our people, our folk-memory of a suffered encounter with God, our patriarchal standard of faith and sacrifice.

But however much the mystery of the *akedah* baffles, this much I know now: that this “testing” of Abraham of my childhood imagination had little to do with the “testing” that pertains to the schoolroom. The Hebrew *nisah* in the context of the *akedah* clearly shows this. It has to be understood in the sense of “tried through suffering,” “caused to suffer,” “put under duress,” “harried,” “harassed.”

Taken in this sense, the *akedah* moves into another conceptual plane. It offers, perhaps, a first foreshadowing of “the suffering servant” motif of the prophets. It suggests affinities with Job—another “test

CHAIM LEWIS is the Director of the Cultural Department of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies and editor of “Jewish Affairs.”

through suffering" story—both possibly written by the same hand or deriving from the same school of wisdom writing. Indeed, one rabbinic tradition would place Job as living in the time of Abraham. Was this prompted by the discovered affinity between the story of Job and the *akedah*?

Certainly the *akedah* and Job share a common didactic purpose; each proclaims its lesson about the nature of the Godhead, the one to confide that God is a God of compassion who abhors human sacrifice, the other to declare God's justice as beyond man's knowing.

Contrary to accepted tradition, I am, at times, moved to the view that the *akedah* is no less a parable than is Job. It loses none of its moral weight even if we discount its historicity, for it moves beyond the actualities of Abraham and Isaac to serve as a paradigm for all suffered love in the man-God relationship.

There is nothing surprising about this. All great writing has this quickening power of transmuting the actualities of tale into the far-reaching symbolism of myth.

Whether we consider the *akedah* as historic episode or homily or both, its importance for us is that it moves beyond its narrow locus *in* time and circumstance to signalise man's predicament *through* time. Its lesson for mankind is that suffering is the cradling condition of human existence. Man's stature as moral being is established only through suffering. To know God is to suffer in the knowing, to be bound, like Isaac, on the altar of existence.

* * *

The *akedah* should never be considered in isolation; it must be read in conjunction with the story of Adam's fall. They belong together; in fact, they may well derive from the same school of writing. Both have man's destiny for theme, the exploration of a relationship between Creator and creature. Both draw on the same test-through-suffering mythology. As we shall see later, the one might be regarded as setting the stage for the other; Adam's fall leads to Abraham redeemed; Paradise Lost advances, as it were, to Paradise Regained.

Again, the chief protagonists in both stories offer an interesting study in contrasts. There is, first, the character of God Himself—no background figure. He commands the lead role in both—a directive, disturbing presence conceived almost in human terms. And yet, how unlike the God of Adam is the God of Abraham. Adam's God is authoritarian, implacable in the face of disobedience, censorious, maledictory—in the style of a jealous deity, intent on showing who is master. On the other hand, Abraham's God is a register of fatherly concerns, just—yet benevolent—seeking human companionship, a walking-together with man in suffered trust as between father and son after the manner of Abraham and Isaac on their way to the *akedah*.

As will be shown later, the *akedah* is, at once, the relation of the discovery of another "face" to God, just as it is of man's new attitude towards his own fate. God, too, must be seen to suffer with Isaac the experience of the *akedah*; in His faithful embrace of man He, also, is bound to the altar of sacrificial love. The *akedah* becomes more acceptable and gains in depth when read at these two levels of meaning.

These two "faces" of God are reflected in the persons of Adam and Abraham. In Adam we have a character unresolved, an elemental innocence, a vague, universal father-figure. As man unknowing, he comes to recognize God as a hostile power, a constant threat to his well-being, indeed, the cause of his undoing. Acceptance is forced on him, his fate sealed with God's curse.

In Abraham, all is resolved—God is his ally, his fleet-footed obedience, his whispered word of confidence in a commitment that gives life its destiny, its purpose. In Abraham, the foundling fate of Adam is at last resolved under the sign of God's covenant; man moves forth into history with an assured sense of destiny.

But if Adam and Abraham are cast in these different images of God, so, too, the serpent of Adam and the ram of Abraham. They are no marginal figures drawn from the bestiary of fable. They play a central part; in fact, they lie at the heart of the story, at once its plot and commentary. The *akedah* without the ram would be as meaningless as the story of Adam without the serpent. Our sages of blessed memory recognized this; they insisted on the singularity of the ram by bestowing upon it the status of having been providentially appointed towards the close of the sixth day of creation. Both the ram and the serpent were conceived as part of God's original plan of creation, their role determined from the very beginning in the drama of man's destiny. And their respective roles in the two stories are decisive—the serpent's disruptive, the ram's redemptive.

It is of interest to note the significant ambivalences of their roles. They relate, not only to the human characters as if they were human themselves, but, also, to the Godhead as though they, too, were compounded of Divinity. Thus, the serpent is both Adam's other self, man's opposing intelligence and God's contrary shadow, His "adversary," as conveyed by the root meaning of "Satan." Once God is conceived as Supreme Power, we have, as it were, to reckon with the opposing intelligence of the serpent, intent on subverting Divine rule. Power begets its anti-power and strife is born out of this conflict of wills. The role played by the serpent in the story of Adam is to reveal death as part of God's creation. In the dawning consciousness of Adam the serpent insinuates suffering as man's inescapable fate, exposing God as a maleficent power.

As a result, Adam comes to recognize his unprotected nakedness;

he is troubled—not as is commonly supposed by the shame of physical exposure—but by the awareness of his essential aloneness; he realizes that suffering is the touch-stone of life, the presiding condition of sentient being. It is through suffering that Adam knows God and accepts resignedly the burden of His moral mandates. But this knowledge is doom-laden. He identifies God as retributive justice from which there is no escape. Plainly, the poison of the serpent's bite has done its work—ever at Adam's heel.

This vision of the Godhead in terms of Supreme Power dominates the early chapters of Genesis. In the encounter of Cain and Abel we have the same doomful presence of God as both witness and judge. Again, too, in the story of the flood, only Noah and his family escape God's "destructive" justice.

It is only when we come to Abraham that we discover God and man meeting in a new, gentler relationship outside of the harsh framework of divine justice—and, significantly enough, the ram is the symbol of this relationship. It is as though a rebuking deity is moved, for once, to match his own benevolence with that of Abraham. Such is His relationship that God seems content to take Abraham into His confidence when He plans to overthrow Sodom and Gomorrah, and Abraham, in turn, is not afraid to question God's justice in a dialogue of gentle reproof.

Such an exchange was not possible with Adam, nor with Cain, nor with Noah. They conceived God as authority, as maledictory threat, as Master of the Universe brooking no other will but His own.

It is only with these guiding insights in mind that we can appreciate how the *akedah* must have come as a rude shock to Abraham. Here was command, cruel and unreasoning; here, seemingly, was God reverting to His earlier role of inexorable deity, intent on extracting from man a devouring, unquestionable obedience.

It was as though God were testing Himself as much as Abraham, testing His own nature against that of Abraham, seeking, as it were, to push His mastery to the limits in a trial of strength with Abraham.

The outcome of this challenge is that God relents in the face of man's capacity to suffer: "Raise not thy hand against thy son . . . for now I know . . .". This knowing of God is born out of Abraham's suffering and Abraham, in turn, learns of God's mercy in the extremity of the *akedah* experience. And so, in Abraham's sacrificial love, suffering becomes an instrument of redemption.

It is at this point of the story that the ram, as symbol, takes over from Abraham. Like Adam's serpent, the ram is God's agent, but with this important difference—the serpent survives with Adam, or, rather, in Adam, both suffering a diminished existence, abandoned, unredeemed, utterly exposed to the naked pain of existence.

Not so with Abraham's ram—the ram is God's own sacrifice for man's redemption; God diminishes Himself, so to speak, through His own created creature in order to secure man's dominion, to declare the promise of relief from the intolerable burden of the pain of life.

The ram, as such, is not offered, as the text may lead one to suppose, in substitution of Isaac; Abraham has no cause here to implore God's forgiveness. It is God's own gift to Abraham, His burnt-offering of atonement for the wrong done to Isaac, and through Isaac, to all suffering mankind.

And, perhaps, in the style of Aggadic exegesis, we might find a supporting text for this in the Hebrew *yireh lo* (Genesis 22:8) which could be rendered as "the Lord will provide *for Himself* a lamb for a burnt-offering." This play on the word *lo* would add a note of reproof to words already charged with dramatic irony.

But all of this is by the way. Important for us is the significance that Abraham attaches to the encounter with the ram, as reflected at the end of the *akedah* story, when we are told that "Abraham called the name of that place *Adonai-Yireh* (Genesis 22:14). This choice of name, when rendered as "The-Lord-will-provide" certainly communicates Abraham's feelings of awe and gratitude at God's gift of the ram as His atonement for Isaac.

The ram, then, is seen to be the pivotal symbol of the *akedah*. In the sacrifice of the ram, God manifests His contrition and reconciliation with man; we are given His assurance of ultimate redemption.

In fact, God appoints the ram just as He lit the rainbow in Noah's sky to serve as His bond of remembrance, His sign of redemptive promise to man. And it is not fortuitous that God's bond with Noah and Abraham are sealed, alike, with a blessing and a promise under oath.

The ram, thus, marks, in a way, God's ascent from the punitive deity of Adam and Noah to the redemptive God of Abraham. God, too, shares man's grief. He, too, wishes to be redeemed in man's love, as man is in God's.

It is not surprising that the Shofar—the ram's horn—has become, in our tradition, the compelling symbol of messianic promise and redemption. Certainly Aggadic imagination has feasted on the ram and its parts as, perhaps, on no other beast of the field. In its embrace, Abraham's ram is less animal than superlative virtue, the emblem of human longing and slain innocence. Its two horns, we are told, will minister, in turn, as trumpet to Sinai and to messianic redemption, its sinews will serve as strings to David's harp, its skin as Elijah's girdle. Even in the surrender of its sacrificial ash the rabbis saw the gathered ashes of the Temple's altar and, perhaps, too, the unatoned ashes of the Holocaust of our own day.

An Encounter With the “Akedah”

ROBERT J. MILCH

SURELY IT IS NO ACCIDENT THAT THREE OF THE Biblical stories which are most profound in their spiritual implications for the modern reader—whose intense thirst for belief and the comforts it brings is often accompanied by a feeling equally intense that such belief and comforts are a sham—are among those selected, by tradition, for recitation and study on some of the most significant occasions of life and the Jewish year. The Book of Jonah, which we read during the afternoon service on Yom Kippur, shows that God's call cannot be escaped. The Book of Job, recommended for mourners during the period of *shivah*, demonstrates that there are mysteries which mortals cannot hope to comprehend. The story of the *Akedah*—the binding of Isaac—read on the second morning of Rosh Hashanah, teaches that, in the most painful and tragic way, faith must be absolute beyond what any human being can rightfully be expected to endure. Indeed, the *Akedah* story, perhaps more than the others, strikes deep into the soul, as any father appreciates when he reflects on the magnitude of his responsibility to his son, and experiences, in a loving glance or gesture, a head nuzzling against him or a hand reaching out to his, the surpassing trust his child has in him—a trust he knows he is someday bound to violate, yet hopes beyond hope that he never will.

The story of the *Akedah* is recounted in the twenty-second chapter of the Book of Genesis. For no clearly stated reason—not that any reason conceivable to human minds would be satisfactory—God commands Abraham to offer up his only son as a sacrifice. Abraham is inescapably confronted with two exquisitely intolerable alternatives: either to disobey a direct command from God, or to kill the beloved child of his old age. The decision-making process is not detailed, nor is the anguish that must have accompanied it. Instead, the text immediately goes on to show us Abraham, in perfect obedience, piety, and faith, setting off with the boy on the agonizing journey to Mount Moriah, the appointed place, there to do the unspeakable thing he has been called upon to do, a thing beyond all ken, an act in violation of everything humanity has been given to understand of morality and decency.

Not long before, for the sake of ten hypothetical good men, men whose existence he could not even vouch for, Abraham—Our Father Abraham, we Jews have always called him, in recognition of his quintessential fatherhood—had questioned and protested the destruction of Sod-

ROBERT J. MILCH, an editor and writer, lives in New York City.

om and Gomorrah. Yet the destruction of his son, his only son, his beloved son, even Isaac, whom he must have known to be good—that he neither questioned nor made any effort to protest against. Not, as some exegetes would have it, because he knew that God would, in the end, release him from the heart-rending task, for if Abraham had known, his obedience would have been meaningless. Rather, he obeyed in the full certainty that he would have to offer Isaac on the altar, and in so doing he responded to a call so insane and sadistic, in ordinary human terms, that were he today, to attempt to do so, we would label him a raving fanatic and invoke all the powers of society and of the state to prevent him from destroying himself and an innocent child.

Perhaps our age, in its spiritual mediocrity, is more humane. Not touched by the infinite as Abraham was, we are obsessed with the finite and the immediate. In his situation we would see the altar, the knife, the blood, and the boy, but not the star-studded sky stretching off to eternity. Though our age has been so cruel as to undercut all belief in progress and moral evolution—perhaps, in the long run, for our good, since our belief in the Messiah makes it clear that man is not perfectible by his own efforts and we ought to be made to know this again—still, we can recognize cruelty and condemn it. What we cannot recognize, though we condemn its few surviving manifestations, is a faith so pure, a piety so fierce, that it is ready, in its fullness, to sacrifice all at the behest of the divine imperative, an imperative so unconditional, that by its nature it contravenes all which common sense, human judgment, and conventional religion reckon to be man's proper mode of behavior.

I cannot say that Abraham was right. Indeed, if called upon in the same way to perform the same act, I would not be able to follow his example, for in my weakness and in my humanness, which are the same thing, I trust most what I can see and touch without effort, and I love my son more than I love God. Perhaps more accurately stated, I have not sufficient faith to discriminate between the call of God and the prodings of the baser aspects of my own nature, but this is begging the question, for even with such powers of discrimination, I feel that I still would not lift the knife and carry out the sacrifice. I would, no doubt, win the approbation of my family and peers and a clean bill of mental health, but our world and our lives are as nothing in the sea of the cosmos, and I should not be too quick to credit myself for what may really be, in the face of eternity, just another expression of the weakness, uncertainty and insecurity that typify our frail, ambiguously godlike species.

What lesson, then, does the tale of the *Akedah* offer? That it gives us Abraham as a model of spiritual excellence is easy to say, but since our very nature as human beings makes it impossible for us to emulate him, what point is there in saying so? If anything, by our act of meas-

uring ourselves against Abraham, we shock ourselves into awareness that human beings aspire to more than they can attain and always fall short of their goals. For, however much we might desire to perfect our faith and follow Abraham's example, we are unable to do so, because of what we are. Man may achieve success in enterprises of his own devising, because in them he makes the rules and sets the standards, but the spiritual sphere is not of his making. Though we cannot avoid engagement in it, the rules are imposed on us; we can never fully know or understand them, and they demand of us more than we can give.

Our confrontation with the *Akedah* teaches us, in short, that man is not perfect; and furthermore, that if he were perfect, he would cease being man, just as Abraham, who came near to attaining perfection by his willingness to do something as inhuman and impossible as obeying a command to sacrifice his son, to take from his child the life he had given him became, at once, something more than, and less than, human. In the end, he was spared the horror of shedding his son's blood, saved from the curse of becoming perfect by an act of divine compassion, for God, in an act of kindness to the father as much as to the son, at the last minute sent a ram as a surrogate for Isaac.

Jewish tradition tells us that man, because of the imperfections and limitations that make him man, is a being of a higher order than the angels, for, unlike the angels, man has a will for good and a will for evil and, again unlike the angels, he can control and direct his actions, making choices and accepting consequences. By graciously releasing Abraham from the duty of killing his son, God kept him from rising to the heights—the heights described by Isaiah, where serried ranks of cherubim, in an unreal astral region of unimaginable purity and clarity, endlessly chant the praises of the Lord—and restored him to our mundane level, the world of sweat and dirt and suffering and ugliness and expediency, yet still a world, sometimes, of courage and dedication, of unselfishness and kindness, of principle and good. By so doing He cast his vote for man, the only one of His creatures whom He had endowed with conscience and free will, legitimizing forever the fact that men, with all their defects, not the angels with their mechanical perfection, are the true objects of His concern, and garbing in a special kind of grandeur our melancholy destiny of striving without hope of winning, our saddening—yet invigorating—obligation to fight the battle well even if victory eludes us, our constant and chastening awareness that the means, which are often within our control, ultimately cumulate over time to become the end.

The lesson of the *Akedah*, then, is the same one so succinctly stated by Rabbi Tarfon in *Pirkei Avot* (2:16): "It is not upon you to complete the task; nevertheless, you are not free to desist from it."

Jews as Political Figures: A Footnote to Diaspora History

ROBERT GORDIS

ONE OF THE FASCINATING BY-PATHS IN JEWISH history during the Diaspora, to which little systematic attention has been paid, has been the role of individual Jews who emerged as significant political figures, if not as leaders, in the various countries with which they identified themselves. It is self-evident that before a Jew could rise to power and influence in non-Jewish society, it was necessary for him to achieve a high degree of "integration" into the general body politic. This requirement was over and beyond the innate gifts and skills with which he had to be endowed. The simplistic observation that "a Jew must be twice as good to get half as far" is not too far from the truth. On the contrary, it is largely supported by the historical record.

Always, the members of the dominant group were tempted—a temptation they rarely resisted—to charge the Jew with being, at best, an "outsider," and, at worst, a traitor and an enemy. Hence, the Jew with abilities or ambitions in the political arena was under steady and relentless pressure to cut his link with the community and to adopt the protective coloration of the majority.

The millennial history of the Jewish people knows only two periods, to be noted below, when gifted Jews attained positions of influence and power in the general community while retaining a sense of loyalty to their Jewish kinsmen and the Jewish tradition. These are the Biblical era in antiquity and the Golden Age in Spain in medieval times. Otherwise, virtually all Jews who achieved important political positions were characterized by alienation from the Jewish tradition and by a lack of concern for Jewish needs and interests. The difference lay only in the degree of their estrangement from their Jewish background. At the least, it might take the form of mere indifference, without any formal act of disassociation from Judaism. Often, it expressed itself by a more radical step, such as formal adoption of the dominant religion of the majority. Their motivation was expressed by the German-Jewish poet, Heinrich Heine, who explained his own conversion by declaring that "the baptismal certificate is the passport to Western society." Not infrequently, the protagonists developed a deep-seated hostility to Jews and Judaism. The careers of these step-sons of Israel fulfilled the words in the book of Isaiah (49:17), which were popularly rendered, "Your destroyers and despoilers come from your own midst."

Since the Bible is the fountain-head of all aspects of Jewish experience, one turns to its pages for prototypes, there, too, of Jews who at-

tained political power and influence, and one is not disappointed. The Bible offers two famous instances which have not generally been viewed from our present perspective. One stands at the beginning, the other at the end of the Biblical era; the first is in Egypt, the second, in Persia, and both are a-typical.

Joseph, the best beloved son of the Patriarch Jacob, is torn away from his family and native land, and is sold as a slave to Egypt. By dint of his ability and energy, he rises to the august position of Viceroy of Egypt, faithfully guiding his adopted land through a difficult economic crisis. He adopts an Egyptian name, Zaphenath Paneah, and marries into the aristocracy by taking the daughter of the Egyptian priest, Potiphera, to wife, raising his children as Egyptians. A few hints given in the Biblical account suggest that he makes the Egyptian life-style his own.

As the superb narrative in Genesis unfolds, it becomes clear that his career follows no ordinary pattern. Ultimately, he is brought into contact with his brothers and succeeds in saving them from starvation by settling them in Egypt under his protection. However, his Jewish interests are not exhausted by his concern for the physical and economic security of his kinsmen. His patriotism has been demonstrated, his position is secure, yet his integration into Egyptian life is somehow less than total. He fears the encroachments of assimilation and, therefore, his aged father, Jacob, adopts the grand-children, Ephraim and Manasseh, thus making them sons of Israel. Joseph is convinced that, some day, his kinsmen will leave Egypt and, therefore, he makes his brothers swear that when that day comes they will take his remains with them to their new home.

Genesis is the first book in the Bible, and Esther one of the last, with a thousand years of history intervening between them. In the Persian Empire of King Ahasuerus, generally identified with Artaxerxes II, there is a large Jewish Diaspora community and anti-Semitism is rampant and full-blown. When the king's emissaries seek a wife for the monarch, Esther is cautioned by her guardian and cousin, Mordecai, not to reveal her identity. Her Jewish background remains unknown to the king until the climax, when she reveals that her people are in danger of massacre through the machinations of Haman. The peril is overcome, Haman is hanged and the mob-attacks on the Jews, now bereft of government support, are repulsed. Mordecai is installed as Grand Vizier; the book of Esther describes him as Viceroy. At the end of the book, we are informed that he attains to power and greatness, and is popular with the mass of his countrymen, seeking the good of his people and promoting the well-being of their descendants.

These two prototypes of Jewish political leadership, Joseph and Mordecai, raise complex and difficult questions for the historian and the literary critic. It is not easy to identify the specific periods of their activity in the absence of external corroborating evidence for their careers. Even

if their historicity be granted, it is clear that their life stories have sustained expansion and embellishment, since they have been retold from the standpoint of religious faith and through the exercise of great literary skill.

What is certain beyond doubt—and this is germane to our theme—is that these two Biblical models of the Jew as a political figure are the exception and not the rule. Their example was rarely followed by those who came after them. Only Islamic Spain in the Middle Ages offers a significant number of instances of Jews who attained high political office and were distinguished by loyalty to their Jewish background.

The earliest post-Biblical figure, whose historicity is not to be questioned, was the first-century Alexandrian Jew, Tiberius Alexander. Evidently he drew little inspiration from his uncle, the distinguished Jewish philosopher, Philo, who was a courageous defender of Jewish rights. On the contrary, Tiberius Alexander became a renegade to Judaism and rose to be the Roman Procurator of Judea. His administration, which lasted from 46 to 48 C.E., was as hostile and unresponsive to Jewish concerns as that of the worst of his Roman predecessors or successors. He crucified the two Zealot leaders, Jacob and Simon, sons of Judah the Galilean, who sought to throw off the Roman yoke. Later, Tiberius Alexander participated in a Roman expedition against the Parthians and, subsequently, served as governor of his native country, Egypt. The capstone of his public career came during the desperate Jewish War against Rome in the years 67-70, when he served as adviser to Titus at the siege of Jerusalem. Tiberius Alexander thus contributed to the burning of the Temple and the destruction of the Holy City.

After the fall of the Roman Empire and the rise of religious intolerance in Christian Europe during the Middle Ages, the rise of a Jew to political power became virtually impossible. The only shining exception was Islamic Spain, where Arabs and Jews succeeded in establishing a remarkable type of cultural symbiosis, competing and cooperating with one another in all the varied fields of culture and public affairs. Both in Jewish and in Arabic circles, philosophy, philology, poetry and science flourished. This activity continued during the Muslim hegemony in the Iberian Peninsula and, in the brief after-glow that persisted even under Christian rule. While group tensions and religious persecutions were not lacking, a spirit of tolerance generally prevailed in Spain. Hence, it was possible for a Jew to rise to public importance in the political sphere, while remaining deeply rooted in Jewish life and tradition.

At the threshold of "the Golden Age" of Spanish Jewry, in the tenth century, stands the figure of Hasdai ben Isaac ibn Shaprut, who served the Caliphs of Cordova as physician and inspector-general of customs. Above all, he was their principal diplomatic advisor, utilizing his knowledge of Latin and his practical sagacity to excellent advantage in further-

ing the interests of his masters. He was a considerable scholar in his own right and was able to prepare an Arabic version of a Latin translation of a Greek medical work for the Caliph. He is also credited with the discovery of the drug, theriac. His diplomatic contacts included the Christian kingdoms of Leon and Navarre in Spain, as well as the Byzantine Empire in the East.

Hasdai's Jewish interests were genuine and intense. Reports had percolated to the West that there was an independent Jewish kingdom far to the East. By means of his diplomatic relations with the Byzantine Emperor, and through Jewish merchants, Hasdai succeeded in entering into a correspondence with the legendary king of the Khazars, a Tartar people, who had voluntarily accepted Judaism about 740, and maintained their independence until their kingdom was blotted out in 1016. The Khazar kingdom, be it noted, is the first example in history of a state according full religious freedom equally to Christians, Moslems and Jews.

Hasdai was also a distinguished patron of Jewish learning, surrounding himself with Hebrew scholars and poets. He may be described as "the foster father of Hebrew philology," since he supported the two pioneer Hebrew grammarians, Menaḥem ben Saruk (910-70) and his opponent, Dunash ibn Labrat (920-90), in their scholarly labors and polemics. At least equally significant was Hasdai's role in installing as spiritual leader of Spanish Jewry a young Babylonian Talmudist, Moses ben Enoch, who, according to tradition, had been captured by Mediterranean pirates and then ransomed by his fellow-Jews. With Moses begins the great era of rabbinic learning in Spain.

The next generation saw the rise to power of Samuel ibn Nagdela, born in Cordova in 993. Samuel, called Hanagid ("the prince"), was "a man of the Renaissance" before the Renaissance. He was well versed in mathematics and philosophy and spoke and wrote ten languages. He initially came to the attention of the Vizier because of his beautiful penmanship and became his trusted advisor. Ultimately, he became his successor at the court of King Habbus. He was an excellent administrator of state and an effective general on the field of battle.

Samuel Hanagid supported Jewish scholars throughout the world—in Palestine, Babylonia and North Africa—and evinced a particular fondness for the synagogues in Jerusalem. His creative gifts showed extraordinary variety. He was the author of a pioneering "Introduction to the Talmud"—a compendium of Talmudic law—and a dictionary of Biblical Hebrew. Though he did not attain to the level of the great triad of Spanish Hebrew poets, Solomon ibn Gabirol, Moses ibn Ezra and Judah Halevi, Samuel was a respectable poet himself, much admired in his own time.

There were other, somewhat less distinguished, Jewish public figures

in Spain and Portugal, who combined loyalty to Judaism with devoted service to their native land, but at least one more should be recalled here. He was the last and, perhaps, the most tragic figure in this category. Don Isaac Abrabanel (1437–1509) served as financial advisor to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. It was his tragic destiny to witness the expulsion of his people from Spain in 1492, a calamity which he strove, in vain, to prevent. After the catastrophe was completed by the expulsion of the Jews from Portugal, he found asylum in the kingdom of Naples, where his financial talents were eagerly employed by the rulers of that kingdom. Aside from other writings, Abrabanel's commentaries on the Bible, which reveal the insights of the statesman, are classics of Sefardic Jewish culture.

The Spanish period is to be viewed as an atypical interlude in Jewish history. It is not until modern times and the rise of secularism that the phenomenon of statesmen of Jewish origin emerges again. The first instance of a significant political figure of Jewish background in modern times is the little-known Peter Shafiroff. The son of a Russian Jewish merchant, he possessed rare abilities which came to the attention of Peter the Great of Russia. After being converted to Christianity, Shafiroff became a trusted advisor of the Czar in his strenuous efforts to Westernize Russia, his career suffering all the vicissitudes of politics. Perhaps because of the paucity of our sources, nothing is known of his relationship to Jews and Judaism during his active career.

In a fascinating volume, *Meshumadim in Tsarishen Rusland* ("Jewish Converts in Tsarist Russia"), the Russian-Jewish historian, Saul M. Ginsburg, devotes a chapter to Shafiroff's career. While he is not intrinsically important, he stands on the threshold of the modern era as a symbol of the able, energetic and ambitious Jew who rises to power and, in the process, discards the impedimenta of Judaism.

The most famous instance of the Jew as a political figure is Benjamin Disraeli (1804–81), later Lord Beaconsfield, who was the prime architect of the once mighty British Empire. A leader of the Tory Party, which he steered in the direction of enlightened conservatism, Disraeli became Prime Minister under Queen Victoria. In this role, he made England a commanding power in world affairs by purchasing control of the Suez Canal from the Khedive of Egypt, later placing upon the Queen's head the crown of Empress of India.

Disraeli was a professing Episcopalian, a faith to which he had been converted by his father, the eccentric literary critic Isaac D'Israeli, in the aftermath of a quarrel with the *Parnassim* of the Sefardic synagogue in London concerning an assessment. Nevertheless, Benjamin Disraeli remained inordinately proud of his Jewish origin. When Jewish political emancipation was opposed by an Irish member of Parliament on the ground that Jews were uncivilized, Disraeli rose and declared, "I would remind the right honorable member that at the time that his ancestors

were running about naked in the forests of Ireland, mine had built the Temple of Solomon." Disraeli was a prolific writer, several of his novels being rooted in a Jewish background, and one, *Alroy*, deals with the history of a colorful Jewish messiah of the Middle Ages, whom Disraeli invested with a halo of glory. To be sure, Disraeli was not infrequently reminded of his Jewish origin, even by his Liberal opponents in Parliament. The English historian, Froude, pronounced this judgment upon him, in which Greenwood concurs: "He was thoroughly and unchangeably a Jew. He was an Englishman in nothing but his devotion to England and in his solicitude for her honor and prosperity." This evaluation sheds as much light on Disraeli's environment as it does upon him. Though Disraeli's sense of identification with his Jewish roots was genuine, it was essentially wedded to the past and was purely romantic in character. At all events, a unique and highly original figure as an Englishman, he was equally atypical of the Jew in politics, by virtue of his positive concern for Jewish rights and his strong Jewish consciousness.

A contemporary of Disraeli and the only American, until our day, in this gallery of distinguished political figures, was Judah P. Benjamin (1811-1884). Born, like Alexander Hamilton, in the West Indies, he was raised in the antebellum South. After studying at Yale, he was admitted to the Louisiana bar, where he attained a phenomenal success. His extraordinary legal talents brought him national recognition, and President Franklin Pierce offered him a position on the U. S. Supreme Court bench, but Benjamin preferred the excitement of politics and the rewards of legal practice. In 1852, he was elected United States Senator from Louisiana, where he became an eloquent defender of Southern interests. Charles Sumner described him as "the most brilliant orator in the United States." His advocacy of slavery was frequently used by opponents of the institution to charge Jews with pro-slavery sentiments. After one of his most powerful addresses in the Senate, a colleague described Benjamin as "an Israelite with Egyptian principles."

Lacking any Jewish background or affiliation, and married to a Catholic, Benjamin, nevertheless, was not totally bereft of some sense of Jewish affiliation. In 1854, he presented a petition to the United States Senate on behalf of a group of American Jews protesting the anti-Semitic discrimination practiced by the Swiss government. At a social gathering, at which Daniel Webster was present, he refused to let himself be described as a Unitarian. Other, more positive instances of a sense of Jewish belonging are lacking.

With the outbreak of the Civil War, Benjamin threw in his fortunes with the Confederacy. Jefferson Davis appointed him, successively, to no less than three posts in the Confederate Cabinet—attorney general, secretary of state and secretary of war. He was described as "the brains of the Confederacy." With the collapse of the South, Benjamin fled to Eng-

land and, at the age of 55, began a new career as a law student in London. At his death, he was universally recognized as one of the greatest members of the British bar.

In the nineteenth century, there were several political figures of Jewish background who had distinguished careers as "leaders of the opposition," but did not attain to power. Perhaps the most colorful was the German Socialist leader, Ferdinand Lasalle (1825–64). Throughout his life, he was both an associate and an opponent of Karl Marx, since he was both a Socialist and a believer in the democratic process. Handsome in appearance, brilliant in debate, he proved a redoubtable opponent to Bismarck, who strove to create a united German Empire on the foundation of militarism and aristocratic conservatism. Lasalle's career ended tragically when he was killed in a duel over a love affair.

A much more sedate leader of the opposition to German Junkerdom was the German politician, Eduard Lasker (1820–84), a founder of the Liberal Party. A highly skillful parliamentarian, he expressed the standpoint of middle-class Germans in general, and middle-class Jews in particular, opposing Socialism on the left and Conservatism on the right. Neither he nor Lasalle ever severed their ties with the Jewish community, but neither did they manifest any special interest in their people.

The twentieth century has supplied several additional examples of this genre. The enlightened German industrialist, Walther Rathenau (1867–1922), had served the State faithfully during the First World War as the official charged with the distribution of raw materials. After the Kaiser's defeat, he served as Minister of Reconstruction and, later, as Foreign Minister. Rathenau saw clearly the dangers of industrialization and strove valiantly to buttress the democratic spirit in his native land. Because he sought to fulfill the post-war reparations agreement and, in general, represented a liberal attitude on domestic and foreign issues, he was assassinated by nationalist and anti-Semitic fanatics. Though he never formally left the Jewish fold, Rathenau evinced little interest in Jews or Judaism during his lifetime. It was his tragic death, rather than his life, that stamped him with the mark of Jewish destiny and made him a brother to the victims of Auschwitz and Treblinka.

A younger contemporary of Rathenau, who played a broadly similar role in another country, was the Russian, Maxim Litvinov (1876–1951). After joining the Social Democratic Party, he changed his name from Wallach and became an early Bolshevik, spending years of exile in London and Switzerland. Becoming Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union in 1939, Litvinov strove to move Communist Russia in the direction of peaceful co-existence and cooperation with the democratic West. Though he had some important successes early in his career, Litvinov failed in his efforts to promote a peace policy or to achieve joint action against the Axis powers. He fell from grace after Stalin negotiated his pact with

Hitler and was replaced by Molotov as Foreign Commisar, in 1939. After serving as Ambassador to the United States for two years, between 1941 and 1943, he went into obscurity, dying in 1951. If he possessed any Jewish bias, he was eminently successful in suppressing it.

Contemporary with the Russian Communist Litvinov, and the German liberal Rathenau, was the French Socialist, Léon Blum (1872–1950). An established literary figure, he rose to influence in Socialist ranks and, ultimately, created the Popular Front, which won an impressive victory at the polls in 1936. As Premier of the brief Popular Front government, he inaugurated a series of important social and economic reforms, and later opposed the Munich Pact. Imprisoned during the Second World War and tried by the Vichy government as one “responsible for the war,” he returned to power briefly as Premier after the overthrow of Nazism.

Unlike Litvinov and Rathenau, Blum was a life-long supporter of Zionist aims in Palestine, perhaps because he had achieved his political awareness during the Dreyfus Affair. Without a formal identification with the Zionist movement, Blum expounded Zionist views in French political circles and participated in the Zurich Conference for the founding of the Jewish Agency. The kibbutz, Kfar Blum, in Galilee, perpetuates his name in the State of Israel.

The pro-Israel position of Léon Blum has been maintained, perhaps even intensified, by the distinguished French statesman, Pierre Mendès-France (born 1907). Elected to the French Parliament at a very early age, he quickly rose to national prominence, and was one of the first advocates of resistance to Nazism. He occupied several important positions in the Cabinet of the French Government in Exile under General de Gaulle, and served actively in the French Air Force. In 1954, he scored a resounding victory at the polls. Becoming Premier, he ended the long and disastrous French war in Indo-China. His policies included growing international cooperation and programs of social welfare. Of Sefardic descent himself, he has been identified with the work of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. He has been a consistent friend of the State of Israel.

A contemporary of an altogether different stamp is Maurice Schuman. Converted to Catholicism in his youth, he has been notably indifferent, if not downright hostile, to Jewish interests and concerns. In 1969, when Pompidou was elected President of the French Republic, Schuman became Foreign Minister, faithfully carrying out the anti-Israel policies of the French government.

Easily the most visible Jewish figure on the political horizon today is Henry Kissinger, chief Foreign Affairs Advisor to President Richard M. Nixon and recently selected by him to be Secretary of State. Even if events were not as kaleidoscopic and bewildering as they are today, we are too deeply involved in the problems and conflicts of the age to

be able to assess Mr. Kissinger's achievement as a whole. At least equally enigmatic is his attitude toward the tradition in which he was reared, and in which, if his teachers are to be believed, he attained a substantial measure of competence during his boyhood. Only the future may reveal what this distinguished and highly gifted negotiator on the international scene has chosen to keep a secret.

Throughout Diaspora history, there have, of course, been lesser figures whose Jewish loyalties were not blotted out by the prestige and influence of their positions on the political scene. By and large, however, the pattern is clear. With the glorious exception of the Golden Age in Spain, most Jews who have attained high visibility on the political horizon reveal the symptoms of Jewish alienation. Having severed any vital link with their people and tradition, they differ from one another only in the severity of the disease. The careers of most important political figures of Jewish origins constitute a tragic item in the price that world Jewry must pay for its continued life in the Diaspora.

Peter Shafiroff— “Jewish” Adviser to Peter the Great

SAUL M. GINSBURG *

Tr. by Claire B. Shapiro

MORE THAN 200 YEARS AGO, DURING THE TIME of Czar Peter the Great, who reigned from 1696 to 1725, the administration of the Foreign Office of Russia was in the hands of a converted Jew. He held the important title of Vice Consul and was considered a distinguished diplomat.

Czar Peter was determined to bring Russia into closer contact with Europe and to Westernize the largely Asiatic Russian people so that they might become an important European power. His aim was to change the Russian mode of life and he let nothing stand in the way of his reform. Before Peter's ascension to the throne, the Moscow Czars were accustomed to consult with leaders of the aristocratic classes, the boyars. Peter I, however, as Czar, broke with the boyars. He had the ability to discover capable men and made it a practice to take them into his service . . . regardless of their social background or national origin. His favorite companion, Prince Alexander Menshikov . . . (1672–1729), had been a poor boy who sold baked goods on the streets of Moscow. Nor was he the only able man whom the Czar promoted from low estate to lofty government position. Peter attracted foreigners as well as talented Russians into his service. Important government positions were held by Germans, Dutchmen, Poles and representatives of other nations. And, close to Peter, we also find two former Jews.

The old Russian regime, isolated as it was from the nations around it, was especially suspicious of foreign Jews. In fact, before the division of Poland (1667) there were virtually no Jewish subjects in Russia. Jews were forbidden to enter Russia, even for a short time. But necessity proved to be more powerful than official edicts, and in 1716 there are reports of Lithuanian and Polish Jews travelling in Russia. Some stayed briefly, just long enough to complete their business. Others settled in order to carry on trade. The Russian administration seemed to overlook these intrusions. There were even rumors that the government, itself, from time to time, engaged in trade with foreign Jews who were able to live in Moscow, buying foreign goods from them. After 1667, when

* This article is a chapter from Saul M. Ginsburg's *Meshumadim in Tsarishen Russland*, 1946.

CLAIRE B. SHAPIRO, a native New Yorker, is a graduate of Hunter College and the N.Y.U. Institute of Fine Arts.

the Smolensk region was ceded to Russia by Poland by the Treaty of Andrusov, many Lithuanian and Polish Jews began to be seen in Moscow. Smolensk had a large Jewish population and many Jewish merchants from that area were able to travel to Moscow to engage in trade and to open businesses. Some even brought along their household effects.

In the 1660's, a Jewish merchant by the name of Feivel Shafir left Smolensk and settled in Moscow. He was known to speak several foreign languages. This is not surprising, as the general impression that Jews in Poland were indifferent to, or ignorant of, worldly knowledge is not entirely correct. In fact, during the 16th and 17th centuries, a number of Polish Jews are known to have studied medicine at the University of Padua in Italy.

Hirsch Kaidanover, who wrote the famous book, *Kav Hayashar*, which was first published in 1705, complains that Polish Jews...

teach their children French, . . . and when they (the children) grow up they do not worry about the children not having attended the *Bes Medresh*. They think only about studying French and other languages. French is their goal and the study of the Torah is a side issue.

For a long time, Poland had carried on an extensive foreign trade in which Jews participated, especially in the exchange of goods with Germany, Turkey and Russia... According to the accounts of the Polish financial community in the 18th century, as much as three-fourths of its export trade was in Jewish hands.

This impressive proportion . . . naturally resulted in the Jews' acquiring a facility in foreign languages. It is not surprising, then, that Feivel Shafir, who was an able Jewish merchant, knew several foreign languages well. He was a man of energy and enterprise; without these talents, one had no opportunity to venture into Russia. On emigrating to Russia, Feivel Shafir changed his family name to Shafiroff, in accordance with the Russian style of address, and there opened a business. He also secured a position in the Pansolsky Prekaz, which, at the time, was . . . the bureau that concerned itself with foreign trade matters. Here he served as a translator. Later, he converted to Christianity and became known as Pavel Shafiroff. When he settled in Moscow, he had brought along his young son who had been born in Poland in 1669. What the boy's name was when he was a Jew is not known. Since he was a clever and talented child, his father was concerned with his education and saw to it that the boy learned many language besides Russian. Thus, the young Shafiroff became fluent in Polish, French, German and Latin. His first job was as a salesman in a store which a rich relative, Yevrianov, owned in Moscow. As is well known, Czar Peter the Great enjoyed going into the town and mixing with the ordinary people. He would visit the shops of foreign craftsmen in order to see how they worked, and would frequent various stores in the city. Often, he would stop in at the Yevrianov

store, and it was there that he noticed the bright young man who was so fluent in several languages. Since linguists were necessary in the offices of the government, Czar Peter, taking a liking to young Shafiroff, appointed him to a post in the Pansolsky Prekaz. But before that, young Shafiroff, with Czar Peter himself acting as his godfather, had embraced Christianity, taking the name of Peter in honor of the Czar.

At first, his assignments were to translate foreign documents and Western books to be printed and used by the government. When, in 1667, Czar Peter undertook his first journey out of the country, he chose Shafiroff to join the distinguished group of Russians who were to accompany him abroad. Travelling with the Czar, Peter Shafiroff visited Germany, Austria, England and Holland. These foreign places, so different from backward Moscow, made a profound impression on young Shafiroff. All that he saw, new and attractive as it was to him, made him an admirer of European culture and ways, and he ultimately became a frequent visitor to the West. At the same time, he was a devoted adherent to Czar Peter's ideas of reform. This devotion to change was psychologically easier for him because, being a converted Jew, he had none of the attachments to the old traditions which were found among so many of the Czar's official family and aristocrats. For many Russians, Peter the Great's new ideas caused intense conflict.

During his foreign travels, Czar Peter had many opportunities to get better acquainted with Shafiroff and his unique talents. As a result, Shafiroff participated more and more in important government assignments. Russia was then preparing for the long and difficult war with Sweden which began in 1700 and lasted for 21 years . . . For Russia, it was . . . a question of life and death. It was a matter of controlling the entrance to the vital Baltic Sea; only then could Russia become a great European power.

In 1698, Czar Peter made preparations to go to war with Sweden, paying as much attention to the diplomatic aspects of the coming conflict as to the military. Above all, he felt it important to make agreements with other nations so that Sweden could find it difficult to secure allies. He was successful in uniting with Poland, Prussia and Denmark in a common cause against Charles XII, and, in all the negotiations, Peter Shafiroff played a major role, demonstrating his skill in diplomacy. Shafiroff was also instrumental in arranging a marriage between the Czar's niece, Princess Catherine, with the Mecklenburg-Schwerin prince, Carl Leopold, in which, instead of a dowry, the groom was promised the recovery of those parts of Sweden (the cities of Wismar and Waterlind) which formerly had been a part of Mecklenburg-Schwerin.

The first years of the war did not go well for the Czar. The nations with which he was allied met with defeats by the Swedish King and parts

of Russia were conquered. Czar Peter, himself, suffered a severe defeat in 1700 at the Narva River. He was forced, therefore, to renegotiate his ties with his former allies and to seek new friends. Again, Shafiroff played an important role in the negotiations and had opportunities to show his outstanding abilities as a diplomat. The war went on, and, in the year 1709, Russia finally achieved some victories. Triumphant, Peter the Great rewarded his aides and, amongst them, Shafiroff. In addition to a gift of 300 families of serfs which the Czar had given to him the year before, Shafiroff was raised to the rank of Privy Councillor and given the title of Vice Consul. Following the Czar's example, the Prussian King and the Polish King also rewarded Shafiroff with high honors, and the ruler of the Ukraine, the Hetman Skrowpodsky, gave him two rich agricultural villages. In the same year, 1709, Shafiroff was made administrator of the entire country, a post which was especially important at that time of developing international relations. In 1710, Czar Peter bestowed on him the title of Baron.

In 1711, war broke out between Russia and Turkey. Here, Peter the Great was not so fortunate. Not waiting for the Turks to attack, he advanced secretly towards the Danube with a small army of 40,000, but before he reached his goal, the Turks, with an army of 200,000 men, intercepted him near the Pruth River. The situation was critical; it looked as though Peter and his entire army would be encircled and captured. Again, Shafiroff showed his diplomatic skill. . . . He persuaded the Grand Vizier of Turkey to negotiate by bribing him with a large sum of money; in this way it was possible to make peace with Turkey on easy terms. Russia merely agreed to return to Turkey the city of Azov and its surrounding territories which she had taken . . . some years before. Thus, the rescue of the Russian Army and the Russian Czar from the danger of disgraceful defeat and capture was due to the efforts of Peter Shafiroff.

In those days, more often than not, high officials of warring governments were taken as hostages to make certain that any peace agreements would be honored as promised. Therefore, in accordance with the demands of the Turkish government, Baron Shafiroff and Graf Shemetiev were obliged to go to Constantinople and to remain there as hostages until Russia would evacuate the city of Azov. Peter the Great did not hasten to carry out his agreement and the Russian hostages remained in Constantinople for two years. While there, Shafiroff's active mind did not allow him to remain long idle. Energetically, he continued to carry on intrigues with the Turks in favor of the Russian government against . . . King Charles XII who, after the defeat of Poltava, had gone to Constantinople to seek aid from the Sultan against the Russians. Shafiroff frustrated these plans of Charles XII and, in 1713, concluded a

treaty with the Turks and returned to Russia. Czar Peter rewarded him generously, with the grant of several estates and promotion to an even higher position. Honors continued to be showered upon him. In 1717, he was appointed Senator. He also received further high orders and the title of Worthy Privy Councillor. Shafiroff also participated in the High Court which, in the year 1718, in accordance with Czar Peter's instructions, pronounced the death sentence on the Czar's son, Alexis Petrovich, for his opposition to the Czar's reforms.

Thanks to the peace with Turkey, Czar Peter was free to concentrate his energies against Sweden. The Battle of Poltava had considerably weakened Charles XII's power, but Sweden still was not defeated. The war dragged on . . . and it was imperative to raise the morale of the nation. Shafiroff, who was an able writer, composed a proclamation claiming that Charles XII, alone, was responsible for prolonging the war and the Swedes were accused of conducting the war "against the practices of Christian political nations." . . . (The war) finally ended in 1721 and, in accordance with the new peace treaty, Russia acquired Karelia, Ingria, Estonia and Livonia, along the Baltic Sea.

If Russia expanded in territory and strengthened her hold on the Baltic Sea, turning Sweden into a second rate power, she had much to thank Peter Shafiroff, not only for military reasons but, also, for the skill with which he carried on foreign relations. His many diplomatic accomplishments included trade agreements with France and Prussia, which were concluded in 1717, in Paris, where Peter the Great, on his second journey abroad, had taken Shafiroff. This time, Shafiroff was also able to speak Italian, which he had learned during his enforced stay in Constantinople. When the representative of the Pope came to Paris to greet Peter the Great, Shafiroff was able to interpret Peter's answer in Italian.

Shafiroff did not limit himself in his career; he also undertook big business enterprises. When he was in Paris, he and one P. Tolstoy proposed to the Czar that they organize a factory in Russia for the manufacture of silk, using French methods. The Czar, who was interested in developing Russian industry, was enthusiastic about the venture. He promised his protection, offering to exempt the new factory from . . . taxes and banning the import of foreign silks. But the undertaking failed, and in 1721 the entrepreneurs were forced to close the factory. Another business venture was somewhat more successful. With Prince Menshikov as his partner, Shafiroff secured a franchise from the government to utilize part of the seashore along the White Sea for the production of certain fish oils. This activity brought in tremendous profits. But trouble arose between the two partners and each complained to the government, accusing the other of dishonesty. The government finally investigated and did find signs of corruption. As a result, the enterprise was taken

away from both partners and turned over to a former Shafiroff associate, the merchant, Yevrianov.

Prince Menshikov, who had never liked Shafiroff, now became his deadly enemy. There were two factions within the circle that had found favor with Czar Peter. One originated in the old Russian aristocracy, while the other was made up of a new class of successful men, those officials discovered by Czar Peter. Understandably, there was friction between the two groups. Although Shafiroff had reached his high position through the exercise of his own talents, he still aligned himself with the aristocrats. The leader of the "self-made" group was his enemy, Prince Menshikov. Another cause for enmity was the fact that Shafiroff had marital ties with the old aristocracy through the marriages of his five daughters to the nobility: Prince Gogorin, Prince Chvansky, Graf Golovin, Prince Dolkoruky and Prince Soltikov. Through his in-laws and relatives, he also became one of the "elite" of the time. It is hardly likely that these aristocratic Russians, with their careful social behavior, would reaproach Shafiroff for having been born a Jew. But Prince Menshikov had no such scruples. He let it be known that Shafiroff was a former Jew and also maligned him by calling him "Yid!"

Shafiroff and Menshikov quarrelled whenever they met, and each tried to cause trouble for the other. As time went on, their conflict became more open. After the victory at Poltava, Czar Peter presented the village of Patchev, in the Ukraine, to Menshikov, who wanted to make the Cossacks there his personal property. Though such an arrangement was illegal, he tried to achieve it, nonetheless, with the connivance of Colonel Skornikov-Pisarov, who was in charge of the region. In 1722, Shafiroff brought these illegalities to the attention of the Czar and Skornikov Pisarov was arrested and brought to trial. Thus, nothing came of Menshikov's plans. However, because of this incident, Shafiroff made another enemy, the Judge of the Senate, who was a brother of the Colonel. He had other enemies as well . . . (who) were looking for ways to bring about his downfall.

Before long, an opportunity presented itself. As Senator, Shafiroff made an illegal decision in a case involving a brother. Prince Menshikov and his followers were quick to use the occasion to place a protest before the Czar, accusing Shafiroff of committing illegal and corrupt acts such as embezzling money on a large scale. When the matter was brought up before the Senate in October, 1722, Shafiroff and Menshikov quarreled in public and attacked each other with vehement language. Shafiroff was particularly abusive. Their disruptive behavior caused the Senate to postpone the session and when Czar Peter was told of what happened, he ordered that a commission of ten Senators be formed to investigate the accusations and to pass judgment on Shafiroff.

Prince Menshikov was in a position to influence the Czar through the Czarina, Catherine, who had once been Menshikov's mistress. The Czar had fallen in love with Catherine when he met her in Menshikov's home and, later, married her. Menshikov's intrigue against Shafiroff was successful. Shafiroff lost the respect of the Senate and, in particular, Czar Peter was angered because Shafiroff had misappropriated government funds. In this respect, Shafiroff was not unusual; nearly all officials in the Russian government took graft. They looked upon the government treasury as their own "kettle" and believed that so long as one had permission to dip into it, the bigger the ladle, the better. Within this *cor-don bleu*, Prince Menshikov was a top chef. There were a number of law-suits against him which accused him of graft and other corruption, but, because he was the Czar's favorite, he was able to escape punishment. Compared to Menshikov, Shafiroff might be described as a saint.

After the ugly scene in the Senate, Menshikov spread the news about what had happened and Shafiroff received widespread public abuse. It was clear that his goose was cooked, or to inject a Jewish metaphor, Shafiroff became a *kaporah hindel* ("a chicken for the *kapporot* on the even of Yom Kippur").

Early in 1723, the Senatorial commission announced its judgment, stripping Shafiroff of all his titles, positions and orders, confiscating his entire fortune and condemning him to death.

Gratitude is not a common attribute of rulers and Czar Peter soon forgot all he owed to Shafiroff. He confirmed the judgment of the Senate and execution was set for the 15th of February, 1723. On the 14th, the following announcement appeared in Moscow:

In accordance with the judgment of the Senatorial Commission, on the 15th of February, 1723, the execution of a highly placed person will be carried out in the Kremlin. His Royal Majesty orders that the public in Moscow beat drums in order that all should know and be present early in the morning to witness the execution.

On the 15th of February, Peter Shafiroff was put in an ordinary sleigh and conveyed to the place of execution. He was escorted to the scaffold. His hands were tied. He was forced to kneel, and his head was covered with a red cap. The executioner, with ax ready in his hands, was about to carry out his duties when a Secretary appeared and declared that, in the name of the Czar, Shafiroff's sentence was being commuted to lifelong exile in Siberia. This was due to the fact that the Czarina, Catherine, realized, at the last moment, that Prince Menshikov's intrigues had gone too far. She had won the Czar over to a plea of clemency. But until this happened, Shafiroff was forced to suffer the disgrace of standing on a scaffold before the crowds of Moscow in fear of imminent death. Shaken, he was brought to the Senate where they recorded the Czar's orders and followed through the usual formalities.

From that time, until the February Revolution of 1917, there stood on a table in the Hall where the Senate of Russia met, a framed document citing Czar Peter I's ukase of January 27, 1724. It warned all government officials to obey the rules and orders of the State. Any contrary actions would be subject to the strictest punishment, as in the case of Peter Shafiroff, who had misbehaved before the Senate on October 21, 1722.

In accordance with the new judgment against him, Peter Shafiroff was sent to Siberia, but he succeeded in presenting an appeal to be allowed to remain in Novgorod, where he stayed, living under a strict guard with an allowance of only 33 kopeks a day for his needs.

Peter the Great died on the 28th of January, 1725, without naming a successor. Therefore, with the backing of the Military, Prince Menshikov was successful in declaring Peter's widow, Catherine, the new Russian ruler, Czarina Catherine I. Actually, Menshikov, himself, assumed most of the power.

Under pressure from the aristocratic party, Catherine was forced to pardon Peter Shafiroff. He was recalled from Novgorod to St. Petersburg, which was then the capital, his titles and honors were restored to him, and he became President of the Ministry of Commerce. However, Prince Menshikov did not forget his old enemy. Nor did Osterman, who had taken Shafiroff's place as Vice Consul and who feared Shafiroff would supersede him. To keep Shafiroff out of the political arena, they created an honorary position for him, the task of writing an official history of the reign of Peter the Great. Yet, they still were afraid of Shafiroff's ability. The shrewd Osterman conceived a plan to get Shafiroff out of St. Petersburg and the Baron was ordered to move to Archangelsk on the Arctic Ocean on the pretext of organizing a Ministry of Commerce there.

In 1727, Czarina Catherine I died and her twelve year old son, Peter, became Czar Peter II. Menshikov's enemies intrigued¹ against him and he was exiled to Siberia. But this brought little joy to Shafiroff. He had no desire to leave St. Petersburg and, therefore, he refused the new post. During the reign of Empress Anne, 1730-1740, Shafiroff again became President of the Ministry of Commerce and a Senator. He again received various honors, but he did not return to his former activities in diplomacy. The fright, grief and privations which he had suffered undermined his health and, in 1739, at the age of 60, he died in St. Petersburg.

Among the diplomats of Russian history, Baron Shafiroff is one of the most memorable. A brilliant negotiator, richly talented in many

1. The intrigues were plotted by the Dolgorukys, an aristocratic family of old heritage who were related to Shafiroff through the marriage of one of his daughters to Prince

fields, knowledgeable in languages, in history and in politics, he was well acquainted with foreign affairs. He possessed an extensive library and was an able writer himself. As a genuine admirer of European civilization, more so than any others of Peter the Great's associates, he lived in the style of Western Europe. True, he had moral weaknesses—love of pleasure, inclination towards intrigue, thirst for money and power—in which he was a child of his age and environment.

Aside from the five daughters who were mentioned earlier, Shafiroff had an only son, Ysaye, born in Moscow in 1699. The father saw to it that he received an exceptionally good education in foreign schools. When the young Baron Shafiroff returned to Russia, following his studies abroad, he occupied many official positions, but never succeeded in starting a government career. He early showed signs of human weaknesses, drinking and gambling. The large inheritance which his father left was lost in liquor and cards. He had several daughters but they were left without means and Czarina Elizabeth Petrovna was forced to support them. She had Baron Ysaye Shafiroff removed to a monastery in Moscow, and there he died in 1758. He was the second and the last of the Barons Shafiroff.

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

PRE-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS

Grants are available to students preparing for graduate degrees in the field of Judaic Studies or in any other field where the specialization or dissertation is related to Jewish community life, institutions, or scholarship.

Students may apply for grants for the purpose of enabling them to complete work or dissertations required by the University. Applications will be judged on the basis of the contribution to be made by such studies to the field of Jewish scholarship. The amount of the grants will be determined on the basis of individual requirement.

Grants will be limited to students who have completed at least one year of graduate study. Applicants must be citizens of the United States.

Applications must be received by December 31st for the next academic year.

GRANTS-IN-AID

The Foundation also offers grants to faculty members and other established scholars to complete writing or research on projects that will make a significant contribution to Jewish knowledge or to interpret and enrich Jewish life in America.

Applications must be received by December 31st for the next academic year.

Applications forms can be obtained from
National Foundation for Jewish Culture
122 East 42nd Street, New York, New York 10017

A New Prayer Book— Conservative Judaism Defines Itself

LEVI A. OLAN

The publication of a *Maḥzor* for Rosh Hashonah and Yom Kippur under the auspices of the Rabbinical Assembly is welcome on a number of counts. The skeptics may view it as a desperate yet futile attempt to revive in the Jew a mood of prayer which at the moment, if it is not dead, is painfully expiring. Living in a pervasive secular milieu, modern man, including the Jew, engages in religious worship in the main because of group loyalty or convention. A prayer book, no matter how sensitively or attractively prepared, cannot elicit a response from those who are spiritually blind. Yet men in our day do worship, Jews attend High Holy Day services in large numbers. The authenticity of their worship experience may be questioned, but the desirability of providing them with the best possible liturgical text cannot be gainsaid. This new *Maḥzor* is so markedly an improvement over those used previously in the Conservative Synagogue that it can only enhance the religious experience.

The common assertion that man today is not a worshipful being should not be accepted without subjecting it to a critical examination. It is true that much of what man asked of God in the past is now provided for him by the marvels of science, which is the success story of modern secularism. Physics, chemistry, and biology do a far better job in satisfying man's creaturely needs than God ever did. Modern man, as Bonhoeffer reminds us, has come of age. The fallacy in this proposition is that it confines the worship experience to a fragment of its totality. Petitional prayer is only one element in worship. There are also expressions of thanksgiving, adoration, and affirmation. For the Jew, it is much more. It is, as Rosenzweig said: "The sum and substance of the whole of historical Judaism, its handbook and memorial tablet. . . ." The prayer book contains the longest record of Jewish life, two thousand years, much longer than that of the Bible or the Talmud. It is for Jews not only a book of common prayer, it is a spiritual history of the Jewish people reflecting the conditions of Israel in earlier times. On its pages are inscribed the people's faith, ideas, hopes, fears, tragedies and triumphs of two millenia. The prayer book is, as Gaster said, "Israel's personal diary."

LEVI A. OLAN is Rabbi-emeritus of Temple Emanu-El, Dallas, Texas, and is currently professor at Perkins School of Theology in Southern Methodist University.

On Yom Kippur a Jew reads in his Maḥzor "These things I remember. . . ." His memory is drawn back to Bar Kokhba, Akiba and the rebels who were martyred. There is a mediaeval *piyyut* recalling him to the persecutions, sufferings, hope and faith of those bloody centuries. This Maḥzor, just published, brings him up to date. There is the frightfully awesome remembrance of the gas ovens at Auschwitz immortalized in the poetic lines of Nelly Sachs from *O the Chimneys*. The late poet, A. M. Klein, reminds the Yom Kippur worshipper about "That little boy, my cousin . . . on what wind shall I reach out to touch the ash that was your hand . . ." A modern Jew may consider himself an atheist alienated from a God who hears and answers prayer, yet in the quip of our day he declares "There is no God and we are His people." This new Maḥzor continues the tradition of extending the record of the Jewish experience in history to our own day.

There is another addition in this latest prayer book, one bright with hope. It relates that Israel has returned to its ancient land and is now a free and independent State. The Jew has come home to find rest from his seemingly endless wandering. What had been a prayer of hope in the Siddur of yesterday is today a fulfillment and a cause for thanksgiving and rejoicing. It is noteworthy that in the face of the reality of the State of Israel, the Yom Kippur liturgy in this new Maḥzor ends with the traditional *L'shanah ha-ba-ah bi-rush-alayim*, next year in Jerusalem, and properly so. The presence of the Jew in Jerusalem today is, as the Midrash informs us, only the first sound of the footsteps of the Messiah. It is visible testimony that the *Malkhut shamayyim*, the Kingdom of God, is a little nearer to realization. The establishment of the State of Israel in our time is only a partial fulfillment of the covenant. The universal goal of the redemption of all humanity is still a demand upon God and Israel. This new Maḥzor could be enriched by more reflective material on the spiritual meaning of the creation of *Medinat Yisroel*.

The two major contemporary events which demand a response from the Jew—Auschwitz and the State of Israel—are reflected in this new Maḥzor. There is another condition in our day which has its roots in the distant past but which is one of the strongest cultural forces challenging modern man. Ours is the most secular age since Constantine. The simple definition of secularism is the organization of life as if there is no God. The implications of this change from a culture of theism to one of secularism may be described as the most radical revolution of our time. For the Jew it is catastrophic. If there is no God, the election and covenant of Israel is a fantasy, and the Kingdom of God in the end of days a delusion. The Jew has survived one *ḥurban* (destruction) after another, major and minor in character. Secularism is an enemy yet to be tested. It is to the credit of this new Maḥzor that it takes note of the danger of secularism in the modern world and helps

the worshipper reflect upon it forthrightly and intelligently. In a meditation following the Shofar service the Jew is reminded that "Resistance to the word of God is no monopoly of the modern mind . . ." Men have always refused to believe since the days of the Bible and have offered the same arguments and justifications which "have seemed conclusive in terms of the culture of the time." It is a brief reflection on the meaning of God in a secular age—it is not a theological treatise. The reader is made aware of the fact that the God-faith has been questioned and doubted since the beginning. He is invited to ponder the implications of a world without God.

Judaism, unlike Christianity, is not, in essence, a theological religion. It does not begin in the mystery of incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection which call for rational explanation. It affirms God who is creator, law giver, and redeemer. Its primary concern is to discover what God requires of man and to devise a program to help man fulfill the divine commandments. In the first five centuries of the common era the church produced a large body of theological literature aimed at explaining the Christian mystery to a pagan community. During that same period the Jew collected an impressive body of Halakhah to help the Jew perform the *mizvot*. Jews took to theology only when the currents of thought of the time presented a challenge. Philo responded to Hellenic philosophy, Maimonides to a revival of Platonism and Aristotelianism, and Mendelssohn to the Enlightenment. The present flurry of theological activity among Jewish thinkers is in response to the disillusionment expressed by Existentialism, the promises of the Enlightenment and its liberal hopes, and, also, to the demands of a scientific revolution which is shaking the pillars of our civilization. The theological spectrum today runs from religious naturalists to Kierkegaardian Existentialists and a variety of way stations in between. Auschwitz is pressing hard upon the Jew of faith for a theological answer which appears at the moment beyond him. Theology is not a natural occupation of Jews, despite the fact that they often engage in it.

There is Jewish theology in the Bible and the Talmud although they are not books of theology. It is in the prayer book of the Jew, however, that we discover the people's understanding of God, man, the universe, and human destiny. Until Rabbi Amram Gaon in the ninth century prepared the first Siddur, it existed as an oral traditions varying in content with the practice in different Jewish communities. His arrangement of the prayers became the framework of the Sefardic prayer book. The *Maḥzor Vitri* of Simḥa ben Samuel, a contemporary of Rashi, is the structural base of the Ashkenazic service. The contents of these differed, but the basic framework was similar and has changed very little since. The arrival of the printing press was instrumental in creating a more uniform structure for the Siddur in both the Sefardic and Ashke-

nazic Synagogues. The *piyyutim* which were added, as conditions warranted, were always to the Maḥzor, never to the Siddur. There were additions, never deletions. Whatever the cultural and historic developments of any age, it never induced a change in the basic form of the prayer book. This process of adding but never subtracting made for prolixity. Israel Abrahams once observed that optional prayers tend to become obligatory. If this suggested, at times, that the service needed to be shortened, it had the positive value of preserving through the centuries the theological foundations of Judaism. The changing winds of doctrine were not congealed into the permanent structure, and until the nineteenth century the prayer book of the Jews reflected a common body of religious thought and beliefs. The compelling appeal of the Kabbalah was easily absorbed in such prayers which preceded the putting on of the *talit* and *tefillin* and in the meditation before the Shofar.

The first serious break with this tradition was introduced by the Reform Movement. The Hamburg Reform Prayer Book shortened the service by deletions, translated some prayers into the vernacular, and eliminated all references to the Messiah and the return of the people to Jerusalem. The first official prayer book of the Central Conference of American Rabbis was issued in 1895 and was a more radical break with the liturgical tradition than anything which had been produced in Germany. In a shortened musaf *tefillah*, the Union Prayer Book excised all prayers referring to the sacrificial service of the ancient Temple. The Kol Nidrei was eliminated entirely and the use of Hebrew reduced to a very bare minimum. The radicalism of Reform lay as much in this break with the tradition of the prayer book as it did in its rejection of the authority of Halakhah as binding.

The only other serious departure from the fundamental structure of the Siddur was introduced by Mordecai Kaplan and his disciples, most of whom were adherents of Conservative Judaism. The Reconstructionist prayer book selects from the tradition primarily on the grounds of theological relevancy to the cultural climate of the modern world. Here, as in Reform, all references to Temple sacrifices are excised. In addition, the idea of Israel as a chosen people is eliminated. Its most serious innovation is a depersonalization of God. Reform Judaism and Reconstructionism responded to contemporary religious and secular thought by breaking with the liturgical tradition of preserving the basic theological structure of the Siddur. They could not resist the urge to try to bring the prayer book up to date. The most recent example of this process of adaptation is found in the soon to be published Revised Union Prayer Book for the Sabbath. We are introduced to theological naturalism by such declarations as "we worship the power that unites all the universe . . . We, too, acclaim the power that makes for freedom." This latest effort by Reform Rabbis bears the name *Sha'aray Tefillah*, a sign

of respect for the tradition and a far cry from The Union Prayer Book. It emphasizes its break with the tradition by its attempt to introduce prayers of sufficient theological variety to satisfy the diversity of beliefs found among Reform Rabbis and, possibly, laymen.

It is through its liturgy that Conservative Judaism may best be viewed and understood. In the beginning, the variety of prayer books used in its Synagogues ran the gamut from Szold and Jastrow, which were a little less Reform in character than the Union Prayer Book, to the Orthodox Siddur without any alterations. It has displayed some hesitancy in creating an official prayer book. In 1927, the United Synagogue of America published a Festival Prayer book in two editions. One eliminated prayers calling for the restoration of the Temple sacrificial service, the other edition retained it. Lately, the Maḥzor most commonly used is Silverman's, with the continued use of Adler and Philips. The changes introduced are mainly in the form of the service. The content is hardly ever altered; with the traditional liturgy there is rarely any tampering. There are no deletions in the text. Modernization is achieved by adding from other literature, both past and present, through translation, and by explanations of some prayers. An Orthodox Jew is very much at home in a Conservative Synagogue worship service if he is not troubled by the use of English and can adjust to some decorum and order. In a Reform service, and, possibly, in a Reconstructionist one, he is not very comfortable.

It is through its worship service that Conservative Judaism answers the persistent demand that it define itself. Wherein is it different from Orthodoxy and Reform? Rabbinic leaders and thoughtful laymen have addressed themselves to the question with varying degrees of clarity and satisfaction. The pages of the proceedings of the Rabbinical Assembly unfold a continuous effort and the issue is still alive. The liturgical practice of the Conservative Synagogue provides the most authoritative answer to the question. It reveals that Conservative Judaism has a passionate fealty to the tradition, from which it departs only when the pressures of the contemporary world are irresistible. At the same time, it is committed to a spirit of relevance to modernity which it tries to express, as well as it can, without loosening the bonds with tradition. It also is struggling with the demands of intellectual integrity at points where traditional beliefs seem to be in conflict with current philosophical and theological developments. This program of Jewish faith is descriptive neither of Orthodoxy nor of Reform. It is the unique trademark of Conservative Judaism.

The issuance of this new Maḥzor under the auspices of the Rabbinical Assembly emphatically re-affirms this description of the nature of Conservative Judaism. The content of the service of worship is traditional, with very little deletion. The *Al ḥataim* prayer in the confes-

sional is omitted, resolving for the moment a concern which has appeared in earlier versions of the Maḥzor. Silverman included the Hebrew text of these prayers but rationalized them and modernized them with a very free translation. But this is the exception to the rule in the new Maḥzor. It is innovative by the introduction of a number of "Reflections," scattered throughout the book, which lead the worshipper to consider the validity of the traditional prayer for his life in the world of today. A modern Jew has a problem with the declaration that God is King. It is a term that reflects a day now unknown and an idea with which we feel uncomfortable. It is, however, so integrally woven in the liturgical tradition that to discard it would rob the basic structure of the liturgy. The Reflection which deals with this describes God as the ruler of the universe which is a cosmos and not a chaos, conceived and created by a God who fashioned it as a place where man's ideals and aspirations may find fulfillment. God as our King is a poetic symbol for the faith we may hold that we dwell in a world which is not "a concatenation of atoms" without purpose or goal. The traditional language is retained and it is made real by an intelligent and clear meditation on the nature of God in His relationship to man.

This prayer book abounds in thoughtful Reflections on some basic beliefs in Judaism. The Haftorah for Yom Kippur afternoon becomes an occasion for a consideration of the nature of sin and the distinction between the sin and the sinner. Jonah, we are told, is not representative of the true prophet of God because he demands that God destroy the sinful people of Nineveh who are not even Jews, without offering them a chance to repent and be rescued. It is the sin that must be exterminated, not the sinner. The language of sin, penitence and redemption is antiquated for the man of our atomic age. This thoughtful passage leads our modern Jew beyond the psychological experience of guilt with which he is familiar to a realm where a man does not live alone. When he fails to do the good, when he misses the mark, it is not fatal. God loves and cares. He is patient and forgives. If a man's humaneness leads him to fail he does so in the presence of a Father whose lovingkindness is ever present. The traditional view of sin, repentance, and forgiveness is preserved. It is, however, made an occasion for a meditation on the nature of man for the Jew of today.

Besides the Reflections, there are notes explaining the meaning of some traditional prayers. Those on the Kol Nidrei and on fasting move beyond the apologetic and historical. There is a sense that we are engaged in a profound experience relating us to the very core of our being. Translation, in this Maḥzor, is used to interpret passages which, in their literal version sound abrasive to the modern mind. A striking example is the *Aleinu* prayer. Silverman's translation reads: "He hath not made us like unto the heathens of the earth, nor fashioned us like unto the

godless of the land; that he hath not made our destiny as theirs." Theologically, this is offensive. The new Maḥzor say: "He made our lot unlike that of other people, assigning us a unique destiny." Thus, by including thoughtful Reflections, explanatory notes and interpretive translations, a modern Jew may experience the tradition in a setting of modernity and intellectual integrity. It is a joy to add that the book, in design, typography, style and organization, is impressive. It is no exaggeration to say that it is the most distinguished Jewish prayer book in form and design thus far produced in America.

This new Maḥzor marks a significant achievement for Conservative Judaism because it makes clear its distinctive character as a Jewish religious community. There remains one major issue which presses hard for a resolution. There is *hefkerut* (anarchy) in the practice of Conservative Judaism, a condition it shares with Orthodoxy and Reform. The root causes lie too deep to be investigated here. A pervasive secularism affects everybody. The heart of the matter is the question of authority. The changes from "Thus saith the Lord" to "survival value" and "Catholic Israel" have not averted the growing lawlessness in Jewish practice. Permitting a Conservative Jew to choose either the majority or minority report of the Law Committee of the Rabbinical Assembly has proved no more effective than following the most lenient decisions of the Halakhah. The present posture is close enough to that of Reform Judaism to blur the differences between them. The liberalization which the Rabbinical Assembly has introduced has not revived the practices of Judaism among the laymen. The low estate of keeping the Sabbath, the second day of the festivals (and for many the first), and the neglect of dietary observance is too visible to be ignored. Marshall Sklare may have described it somewhat extravagantly in saying: "Conservative Jews have broken with Halakhah as a system."

The search for authority is one of the central concerns of our day. This is true for our political, economic, social, familial, as well as for our religious institutions. The lawlessness which describes our age has its roots in the disappearance of authority. The exception is the use of force, which is not available to religious bodies. In this climate all branches of Judaism are confronted with a challenge which has thus far escaped resolution. If we stress *K'lal Yisroel*, following what the majority of Jews practice, we will end up foregoing the practice of all *mizvot*. If we choose that which only a few Jews follow, Jewish life will be frozen into a status quo. The life blood of Judaism is the historical evolutionary process which allows for the development and growth of the tradition. This is the genius of the creative Halakhic process which, at its best, is characteristic of Orthodoxy, is certainly the avowed program of Conservative Judaism, and, in a real sense, is basic to Reform Judaism.

To accept the minority view of the temporarily powerful ecclesiastical rabbinate in Israel is to invite stagnation and obsolescence.

Thirty years ago, Rabbi Boaz Cohen, chairman of the Committee on Law of the Rabbinical Assembly, reported to his colleagues on the now celebrated *agunah*. "The Rabbinical Assembly alone lacks jurisdiction and authority to introduce a Takkanah that affects American Jewry entire, over against the opposition, no matter how it be motivated, of the religious leaders of the Orthodox community. Since the Rabbinical Assembly is committed to the preservation of traditional Judaism, I believe it would not consciously undertake to introduce such a far-reaching innovation in Jewish life in gross violation of traditional Jewish procedure." Today, this reads like a plan for the entombment of Judaism. Orthodox Judaism, it appears, has forfeited its historic role of giving life to the Torah through the interpretive method of the Halakhah. Their leaders declare themselves unworthy to make new decisions in the presence of the great Rabbinic authorities of the past. This is nothing more than an announcement of the death of living Judaism.

Is there a way out? Ellis Rivkin writes: "We can establish norms, we can give direction, we can urge, persuade and dissuade, but we cannot compel . . . Ultimately history has shown that the best system of religion is its ability to evoke voluntary loyalty and sacrifice on the part of its adherents. The generation of enthusiasm is never attained by force or compulsion." In this spirit, the new Maḥzor points the way. The theological foundations of Judaism are now clear, the tradition is preserved and made relevant to modernity. It projects the view that God is, that He chose Israel with whom He covenanted to be co-workers in the building of the Kingdom. This is the only authority. The Rabbis declared it in language which is unmistakable. A Jew must first accept *Ol malkhut shamayyim* before he can perform the *miṣvot*. There is no escape from that today. In an overwhelmingly secular period, it is the only way. There is no substitute for the voluntary commitment of the Jew to the covenant with God. The Rabbinic leadership of Conservative Judaism which has now eloquently defined the meaning of Jewish faith for a modern Jew is now challenged to persuade the laymen to understand it, accept it, and commit themselves to practice it. This road is probably the only one open to Orthodox and Reform Rabbinic leadership as well.

“Modern” Prayer— At What Sacrifice?

STEVEN RISKIN

THE RABBINICAL ASSEMBLY HAS PRODUCED WHAT is perhaps its best and most representative offering to American Jewry with the publication of the *Mahzor* for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, edited by Rabbi Jules Harlow. This expertly designed text—carefully and caringly put together both in terms of form as well as content—reflects the strengths, as well as weaknesses, of the Conservative Movement. The “beauty of Japheth” is expressed with modest but exquisite design. Harlow has added readings and poetry from classical Jewish sources as well as from the contemporary Jewish experience. He has attempted to be relevant but not too relevant, creative but not iconoclastic; he understands that although there is nothing as timely as today’s New York Times, neither is there anything as outdated as yesterday’s New York Times. However, from questionable English “translations” (or rather paraphrases) to major omissions from the traditional Hebrew text, the new *Mahzor* is beset with the same inconsistencies which plague the Conservative Movement in general. Harlow seems caught between the Scylla and Charybdis of accepting or rejecting the traditional halakhic requirements of *Yomim Noraim* prayer, and, as a consequence, hedges with the tradition in place of taking a firm stand in either direction. And so, despite some very praiseworthy expressions of religious struggle and creativity, I suspect that this Prayer Book will satisfy the needs neither of the traditionalist nor of the experimentalist.

The most blatant departure from tradition reflected in Conservative prayer is the deletion of all references to the renewal of the Temple sacrificial cult. The previous Rabbinical Assembly Prayer Books have changed the tense of the references to sacrifice from future to past. Harlow completely expunges the *Avodah* from the Yom Kippur Musaf Amidah, but includes a truncated version after the final kaddish as an apparent option for the more traditional congregations. In so doing, I believe that he is sidestepping a crucial theological issue and robbing the Yom Kippur Musaf of its most powerful *raison d’être*.

In dealing with the traditional approach to the problem of sacrifice, it is necessary first to understand the basic notion of prayer as understood by our Sages. Maimonides maintains that the obligation to pray daily is Biblical in origin, based upon the command “to serve Him with all your

STEVEN RISKIN is Rabbi of Lincoln Square Synagogue and instructor in Talmud at Yeshiva University.

heart" (Deuteronomy 10:10). This service of the "heart" is defined by our Rabbis as prayer.¹ Nahmanides disagrees, insisting that the only Biblical injunction is to call upon God in times of need; the Biblical source teaches "and when you go to war in your land against the adversary that oppresses you, then you shall sound an alarm with the trumpets; and you shall be remembered before the Lord your God and you shall be saved from your enemies" (Numbers 10:9).²

These two giants of Biblical commentary and halakhic direction are, in effect, disagreeing over the fundamental motif of prayer. For Nahmanides, prayer is essentially a cry of petition from mortal, frightened creature to omnipotent, concerned Creator. Hence, one is enjoined to pray only when the existential need arises. For Maimonides, prayer is the statement of commitment of the sensitive Jew to the Master of the Universe who bestowed upon him the gift of life. Hence, one is enjoined to pray daily. Petition is the Biblical essence of the Amidah for Nahmanides. Praise is the Biblical essence of the Amidah for Maimonides. Our prayers basically correspond to the Patriarchs' and their moments of personal and spontaneous dialogue with God, Nahmanides would argue. Our prayers basically correspond to the sacrifices, and must be seen as an act of individual dedication to the Owner of all, would argue Maimonides. The Bible views prayer as God's gift of *hesed* to man, states Nahmanides. The Bible views prayer as man's debt of obligation to God, states Maimonides. And whatever the original Biblical intent of prayer may have been, the moment the rabbis enjoined prayer thrice daily, they clearly expected us to fulfill thereby our expression of indebtedness to Him who spoke and the world came into being.

Any true appreciation of the sacrificial cult must be predicated upon man's realization of this debt to the Divine. If Jewish tradition allows for the possibility of man to strive with God (witness Abraham, Job, R. Levi Yizhak), it must certainly recognize the necessity of man's bowing to the Divine will. The religious moment begins with the humble expression of man's creaturehood before the awesome God-Creator, Author of Life. The sacrifice of Isaac reflects just such an awareness, and Jewish history is, unfortunately, replete with many Abrahams who were never privileged to hear the sound of Divine reprieve. Every whole burnt offering (*olah*) is symbolic of man's total commitment to God and is reminiscent of the original demand by God of an *olah* from Abraham. At the very least, when a Jew would bring his first fruits, first-born animals, tithes and gift-offerings to the priests of the Temple, he was expressing and experiencing the fact that human ownership is implied and not real, that God must receive "His" before we can partake of "ours." And when the Jew brought a sin-offering, he was graphically demonstrating—in a far more

1. Maimonides, Mishnah Torah, *Hilkhot Tefilah*, chapter 1, halakhah 1.

2. Maimonides, *Sefer Hamizvot*, *Mizvot Aseh* 5. Vide Comments of Nahmanides, *ibid*.

consciousness raising manner than the beating of the breast in *al-het*—that our lease on life obligates us to fulfill the covenant outlined in the Torah, the Book by which and for which we live. How superficial sound the carnivorous critics of animal sacrifice, especially in the light of the antiseptic boredom which characterizes most of our modern Synagogues!

Moreover, Judaism is a historical religion which expresses an organic development within which the earlier strata remain, even as the later strata emerge as most significant.

The entire Jewish national experience must be relived during the yearly life-cycle of every Jew, and just as everyone must view himself as if he (personally) left Egypt,³ so must every Jew's existential history reach back to Sinai and forward to the Messianic age. Hence, the descendants of Aaron are accorded the privilege of being called first to the Torah and bestowing upon the congregation the priestly benediction even after the Mishnah declares that a scholarly *mamzer* (product of adulterous or incestuous union) precedes an ignorant High Priest⁴ and the destruction of the Temple rendered the priestly class largely inoperative. In such a manner is the priesthood, which represented the primacy of Divine Service and Torah study during the very genesis of our development as a people, allowed to remain eternal even as the scholar-saint from any family in Israel was given the opportunity to assume leadership as the exigencies demanded. Therefore, despite the fact that our Sages believed that Judaism could survive without animal sacrifices and, thus, limited the procedure to the Holy Temple period, and Maimonides even went so far as to suggest that the entire sacrificial cult was a necessary concession to the generation which left Egypt,⁵ the Jews for thousands of years have gloried in and yearned for the unity, pomp and commitment articulated in Holy Temple Sacrifice.

And nowhere does this aspect of re-experiencing the past Temple Service find more graphic expression than in the Musaf of Yom Kippur.⁶ After the usual praises, petitions and *piyyutim* which are to be found at the outset of every Yom Kippur Amidah, begins the awesome and intricate *Amiz Koah*. This is a rhymeless, alphabetical acrostic composed by R. Meshullam b. Kalonymus, a tenth century Italian sage, who,

3. Mishnah, *Pesahim* 10, Mishnah 5.

4. Mishnah *Horayot* 3, 8.

5. Vide Nahmanides, Leviticus 1:9. (It is widely believed that Maimonides originated the theory that animal sacrifices constituted a system of Divine pedagogy designed to wean the Israelites from pagan practices, and thus, by implication at least, that their role and significance were temporary. Actually, Maimonides was building on rabbinic foundations. The idea is expressed in the *Midrash Leviticus Rabbah* on the verse in Lev. 17:7: "So they shall no more slay their sacrifices for satyrs." R.G.)

6. It is interesting to note, as an aside, that Richard L. Rubinstein, the only Jewish theologian to have joined the "God is dead" movement, affirms liturgical references to the sacrificial cult and, especially, the Yom Kippur Avodah because of the inescapable conflicts and limitations of weakness within the human personality. Vide Rubinstein, *After Auschwitz*, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1966), pp. 93-111.

in clipped five-word lines, evokes the power of the Almighty as creator of a marvelous and mysterious universe. After briefly outlining the strengths and weaknesses of the Biblical personalities—concentrating upon the duty of commitment to the Almighty—he begins a precise commentary of *Mishnah Yoma* which describes in detail the Priestly Temple Service on Yom Kippur. And as the High Priest's confessional is invoked, and the *paytan* describes the reaction of the priests and the people gathered in the Temple Court who bowed, prostrated themselves, worshipped and fell on their faces as they heard "God's glorious and revered name clearly expressed by the High Priest with holiness and purity," it is the custom in most Orthodox synagogues that the majority of the worshippers fall on their faces before the Holy ark. It is as though the very words of the High Priest are echoing through history, and the modern synagogue becomes miraculously transformed into the Holy Temple courtyard. This Avodah is repeated three times, and leads into the poetic description of the magnificent countenance of the High Priest as he leaves the Holy of Holies with assurance of Divine loving kindness and forgiveness. At no other time does the Synagogue seem so involved with majesty and awe. At no other time do we so glimpse the *mysterium tremendum* of total commitment to God. At no other time does so glorious a moment of Jewish past enter into our present.

And the Traditional Mahzor does more than recapture a unique moment of Jewish past. The *paytan* insists upon God's continuing forgiveness by mournfully depicting the torturous slaughter of ten great sages during the Hadrianic persecutions in the *Eileh ezkerah*, our Martyrology. The implicit message of this juxtaposition of themes is that in the absence of animal sacrifices—as a result of our loss of grandeur and national sovereignty with the Destruction of the Temple—we have been called upon by the gentile world to give human sacrifices because of our faith commitment. The mystery of the Temple cult thus moves into the mystery of Jewish destiny; Israel, the people, merges with Isaac the whole burnt offering, as we gain the right to seek—nay, to demand—forgiveness and redemption with the conclusion of the Amidah. The sensitive Jew cannot but agonize that, just as a ram was inexplicably chosen as scapegoat, similarly were the great Jewish martyrs inexplicably chosen. And the absurdity of Jewish slaughtered achieves momentary grandeur in the context of Divine sacrifice and atonement . . .

The Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor, by relegating an abbreviated version of the Avodah to an appendix of the Musaf Amidah after the Martyrology has been concluded and as a mere option for those congregations which wish to recite it, has deleted the very essence of our traditional Musaf.

Harlow is to be complimented for adding to the *Eileh ezkerah* contemporary themes of Jewish martyrdom and heroism from the Euro-

pean experience. The spark of Jewish poetic creativity must be rekindled in the tradition of *piyyut*, especially since these last three decades have seen us emerge from the depths of Auschwitz to the heights of Jerusalem. Rabbi Schwab has composed a stirring elegy for the six-million which is recited by many Synagogues on Tisha B'av and could well be added to the Yom Kippur Martyrology. The confessional before God and our perished brethren because of our complacency during the most critical period of Jewish history—"We have sinned against you and them by useless conferences, by not using our power, by appeasement"—composed version of the Avodah to an appendix of the Musaf Amidah after the by Rabbi Avraham Holtz (p. 580), serves this purpose only too adequately. Indeed, it sounds ominously familiar to those of us who are involved in the Soviet Jewry movement. But how much more meaningful would be these additions if they followed the Avodah, as an agonizing expression of the full-circle substitution of Isaacs for the lambs!

What I find even more difficult to understand than the misplacement of the Avodah is the inconsistency with which the Rabbinical Assembly Maḥzor deals with the issue. The traditional Maftir for Rosh Hashanah, which describes the Temple Sacrifice (as well as the entire Torah reading for Yom Kippur) is retained. And the reason presented is much stronger than historic authenticity. Harlow cites a Talmudic passage as an introduction to the Maftir (p. 179). The Talmud understands animal sacrifice as a Divine gift of atonement for committed sins, and suggests a dialogue between God and Abraham:

Said Abraham: "That will suffice while the Temple is standing. But when there is no Temple, what will become of the people Israel?"

Said God: "I have already arranged for them passages concerning the sacrifices. Whenever they read about the sacrifices, I shall consider them as having offered sacrifices in my presence, and I shall forgive them all their sins." (*Megillah*, 316).

Now, if the sacrifices have no legitimate place in the liturgy, the Maftir from Numbers 29:1-6 ought likewise be substituted—or at best included as an alternative. If Harlow accepts, in any sense, the theological rationale offered by the Talmud *Megillah*, or if he is historically sensitive to recalling a significant moment of Jewish past within our present, why not include the Avodah in its rightful place in the liturgy!

And when the Maḥzor does offer an alternate Torah reading, during the Yom Kippur Afternoon Service, I believe Harlow misses the point. We traditionally read of the strict laws of morality and the prohibited sexual alliances from Leviticus 18. Our Sages are saying that Judaism maintains—contrary to liberal secular opinion—that proper sexual behavior is insisted upon by an absolute system of Jewish ethics. And they are articulating the paradox of the human personality in that the holiest of men on the holiest of days in the midst of the holiest activities can still be tempted by the desires of the flesh. Despite the eternal relevance

of Leviticus 19:1-18, which is used by Harlow as a substitute and which, by the way, includes the commandment to offer animal sacrifices, Jewish tradition has much to teach contemporary "new morality" society with its original enjoinder for Yom Kippur afternoon reading.

One of the most positive features of the Rabbinical Assembly Prayer Book are the various poems and readings from contemporary Jewish life. The structured prayer book was never meant to exhaust Jewish prayer. Many portions of the *Siddur* were compiled through many centuries, spanning the Biblical *Shema* and the present-day "Prayer for the State of Israel." The entire field of *piyyut*, sadly neglected in most religious educational institutions, epitomizes the well-spring of Jewish creativity expressed through the liturgy. However, it must also be remembered that the spontaneity of the *piyyut* must not be allowed completely to dominate the structure of a traditional service. Our Sages attempted to teach theology through the *Siddur*. There is a specific emotional mood which the prayers of the various festivals attempt to evoke. It is for this reason that I take strong exception to the placement of the prayer "In Your Image," written in French by Miriam Kubovy, adopted from Shulamit Kulagai's Hebrew translation, and included in the *Maḥzor* immediately preceding *Borkhu* on the first eve of *Rosh Hashanah* (p. 18).

The prayer is an honest one, attempting to come to grips with the conflicting emotions of a Jew sensitive to the evil and inequity which appears to reign roundabout.

We can worship you . . . We can hold You responsible,
We can struggle with You for all that seems unjust
and ugly,
We can contend with You,
We can refrain from resembling You,
We can reject what we do not understand . . .

Now there is certainly room within Jewish tradition for an honest confrontation with God. Abraham cries out: "Will the judge of the entire world not act justly?," and this cry has been reiterated by Moses, Job and countless religious leaders throughout Jewish history. I might even understand the inclusion of such a prayer on the Day of Forgiveness. In fact, one Hasidic saint suggested that the reason for the double form *Yom Kippurim* (literally Days of Forgivenesses) is that we must forgive God even as He forgives us. However, this is not the traditional motif of Rosh Hashanah. Rosh Hashanah ushers in the Ten Days of Repentance. These are the days of introspection, when the individual becomes aware of the passage of another year, the mortality of his own existence, the unfulfilled potential of his own life. The call of the Shofar is the call to return to God, to morality, to forgotten ideals. On Rosh Hashanah we judge ourselves in the light of an objective, omniscient Divine Ruler.

This day must begin, not with man's calling God to task, but with God's calling man to task. Anything less is arrogance.

Finally, I must question many of the English translations or paraphrases throughout the Maḥzor. Once we accept the Talmudic statement that "every translator is a liar,"⁷ we begin to perceive the inherent difficulties involved in translating any classical work of art. Since I also agree with Bialik's feeling that reading Hebrew in translation is like kissing a girl through a veil, I would attempt to make the veil as thin as possible by endeavoring to be as close to the original as possible. Whenever a translator, gifted as he may be, paraphrases in order to capture the "true flavor of the original," I am reminded of a most devastating theatre experience in Jerusalem which was billed:

Macbeth, by William Shakespeare

Translated and improved upon by Chaim Schwartz.

And if Harlow is in theological disagreement with the original and, therefore, paraphrases the translation, I would prefer that he change the Hebrew text rather than be guilty of intellectual dishonesty by mistranslating the Hebrew. I, therefore, cannot condone rendering *Mehayyeh hametim* as "Master of Life and Death" (p. 31 and passim). This is particularly perplexing, since Harlow seems to be sensitive to the eternal quality of the human soul when he includes the line:

We are grateful for our dreams,
and our soul so beautiful, which death cannot touch
(*nishmatenu bat almavet*) (p. 19).

Harlow evidently believes that God does quicken the dead by endowing man with an eternal soul. Why, then, hedge with the blessing in the Amidah? And if, indeed, the notion of God's quickening the dead be so jarring to the modern mind, consistency demands that the Hebrew be either deleted or changed. Similarly, the plea of the Cantor that the angels bring his prayer before God's glorious throne in the *Hinneni* is lacking in Harlow's English rendering (pp. 236, 237). If the poetic allusion to angels is so distasteful to Harlow, it should be likewise omitted from the first blessing preceding the *Shema* as well as from the Hebrew of the *Hinneni*. Apparently, Harlow is caught on the horns of his own theological dilemma, but it is unfortunate that the Prayer Book must reflect his unresolved questions.

In conclusion, I must admit to have been taken aback by the Hebrew reference to America in "A prayer for our Cuntry" (p. 196) as "a light to all nations." No matter how patriotic we may feel, this is a phrase which ought to be reserved for Israel, alone, as the specific prophecy for the Messianic Age. And perhaps it takes a Messiah to speak a language inspiring for all men. Harlow tries valiantly, but I believe he sacrifices too much in the attempt.

7. Babylonian Talmud *Kiddushin*, 49a.

Whither Conservative Liturgy?

LEONARD LEVIN

THE RECENT PUBLICATION OF THE RABBINICAL Assembly's *Mahzor for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur* marks a turning point in the development of the Conservative Movement. The contradictions in the new *Mahzor* bring into focus the contradictions that have been latent in Conservative Judaism for decades and that can be repressed no longer. Indeed, they threaten to tear apart the very fabric of Conservative belief and practice, unless a vigorous new development of theory can show the way to their possible resolution.

The basic contradiction is summed up in the slogan, "Tradition and Change." Apologists will insist: this is a polarity, not a contradiction. But what is the difference? A polarity is a relation between opposites in which each is granted its just due and is thus enabled, by virtue of its confirmed identity, to serve as catalyst in bringing out the best in the other, its opposite. But in order to accomplish this, we must understand what is the "just due" of each member; we must have an accomplished theoretical understanding (or, at best, a keen artistic intuition) of how thesis and antithesis can be resolved in a synthesis, which is no mere bartered compromise but, rather, an integral whole, whose constituent parts are not repressed for convenience's sake, but each realized to the fullest extent possible. In the absence of the conception of a unified whole, or the theoretical appreciation of how such a whole must be achieved, every attempt at balancing a polarity will result only in contradiction.

The Conservative Movement began conservatively, at first, to implement its approach. In the 1946 *Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book*, it offered the first truly readable English translation of the traditional prayers; it added a few new prayers in the Torah service (and more in the supplementary section); it universalized *Sim shalom* and abolished *Shelo asani ishah*; and it put the sacrifices into the past tense. This was a modest beginning; certainly there was no hint here of censoring whatever of the past did not meet with our approval. Robert Gordis quoted Israel Abrahams in the Introduction: "This is the virtue of a historical religion, that the traces of history are never obliterated. . . . The lower did not perish in the birth of the higher, but persisted." Yet this arrangement did not quite satisfy the next prayer book commission, which, in the 1961 *Weekday Prayer Book*, offered two versions of the *Musaf*, the preferred version abolishing sacrificial references, the alternate version putting them into the past tense. Somehow, one got the feeling that more

LEONARD LEVIN belongs to the New York Havura and writes for RESPONSE.

change was regarded as necessary, yet the only accepted mode of change was to make more emphatic the rejection of sacrifices.

One looks to the 1972 Maḥzor for yet a more radical anti-sacrificial posture, and one is not disappointed. One reads: *V'et musfei yom . . . hazikaron hazeh asu v'hikriyu l'fanekha k'mizvat r'zonekha kakatuv b'toratekha. V'sham otkha b'yirah naavod.* One looks in vain through a concordance to see where, in the Torah, it is written, "And there we shall serve you in reverence." One realizes that a new usage has just been coined for the phrase, *kakatuv b'toratekha*, which no longer requires that the quotation actually be quoted. Yet one glimpses a foreshadowing of this procedure in the English translation of the 1946 prayer book, in the passage:

May it be Thy will, O Lord our God and God of our fathers, to lead us joyfully back to our land, and to establish us within its borders where our forefathers prepared the daily offerings and the additional Sabbath offerings, as it is written in Thy Torah, through Moses, Thine inspired servant.

The Sabbath Offering:
(Numbers 28:9-10)

And, finally, the contradiction underlying this whole approach is laid bare in two passages where the censor's work is plain for all to see:

Lead us with song to Zion Your City, with everlasting joy to Jerusalem Your sanctuary, where our forefathers offered their sacrifices of well-being and their burnt offerings. And thus is it written in Your Torah:

"On your joyous occasions, your fixed festivals and new moon days, you shall sound the *trumpets*. . . . They shall be a reminder of you before the Lord your God; I the Lord, am your God." [p. 279—ellipsis omits: "over your burnt offerings and your sacrifices of well-being."]

Upon a day like this bring us rejoicing to Jerusalem restored, together with all who serve You in love, as declared by Your prophet Isaiah: "And I will bring them to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer . . . and My house shall be called a house of prayer for all people everywhere." [p. 287—ellipsis omits: "their burnt offerings and sacrifices will be accepted on My altar."]

These revised passages are simply falsifications, in that the blowing of trumpets in empty space, in the absence of sacrifices, is *not* commanded in the Torah, and the establishment of a universal House of Prayer without sacrifices is *not* prophesied in the book of Isaiah. Furthermore, if we accept the blowing of trumpets because it is commanded (as the quotation implies), if we accept the universal House of Prayer because it is prophesied, then we must accept sacrifices. If we reject sacrifices, then we reject the binding authority of Torah and prophecy; then neither the trumpets nor the House of Prayer, nor redeeming the first-born, nor setting aside ḥallah, nor daily prayer, nor fasting on Yom Kippur, nor observing Rosh Hashanah, nor observing Shabbat and kashrut, are incumbent on us as commanded through the Torah.

Yet Conservative Judaism has always operated as though most of

the things mentioned were commanded us through the Torah, but sacrifices were not. Either God revealed the former but not the latter, or God revealed both but intended the former for all time and the latter only for "our forefathers." Or perhaps God speaks to us, too, telling us that only certain parts of the ancient *Gesetz* are really *Gebot* for us (just as He tells certain of our contemporaries that it is only through Jesus that they can really come to Him). In any case, Conservative Judaism has always assumed the validity of an expurgated Torah; the new *Maḥzor* only makes the assumption explicit.

From a certain theological point of view, such selectivity would be tantamount to judging the Bible by man's finite standards and, therefore, anathema. Interestingly enough, this very point of view is represented in the 1972 *Maḥzor*'s supplementary "Reflections." The quotation is from Will Herberg:

The fact of the matter seems to be that the modern unbeliever refuses to believe for the same basic reason that the unbelievers of all ages have refused: the biblical word is a decisive challenge to his pretensions of self-sufficiency and to all the strategies that he has devised to sustain them. Modern man is ready to "accept" revelation if that revelation is identified with his own intellectual discovery or poetical intuition. But with the revelation that comes from beyond to shatter his self-sufficiency, to expose the dereliction of his life and to call him to a radical transformation of heart, with that revelation he will have nothing to do. (p. 233)

Herberg is at least consistent in regarding faith as total self-surrender, necessitating, of course, surrender of reason and critical awareness. Unfortunately, he has no basis for assuring us that "The real decision is . . . between faith in some false absolute, in some man-made idol—the construction of our hands or heart or mind—and faith in the true Absolute; in the transcendent God" (*Maḥzor*, p. 229). Since I am totally convinced that the Bible is a construction of the human mind and heart, it follows for me that the faith in the Bible which Herberg recommends is an idolatry by Herberg's own definition. A "true believer" could believe that he had overcome this difficulty, by regarding the Bible (or Jewish tradition) as God-given and the absolute way to salvation. But under no circumstances could he reconcile this with a "tradition and change" approach (since the changes are confessedly man-made), or have the kind of belief in the expurgated Torah that would enable him to *darven* the above-cited prayers with true *kavanah*. If we inquire, under what conditions *could* someone *darven* these prayers with true *kavanah*, I think the answer is that a considerable degree of ignorance or self-deception must be presupposed.

The *Maḥzor* offers a few specimens of ventures toward a new prayer style which takes cognizance of our theological disorientation and tries to deal with it constructively. There is, for instance, Miriam Kubov's challenge and reconciliation:

In Your image did You fashion us,
and You are obliged to be with us.

*Thus we can worship You,
we can ask Your forgiveness,*

and we can hold You responsible, we can struggle
with You for all that seems unjust and ugly.

*We can contend with You,
we can refrain from resembling You,
we can reject what we do not understand,*

and we can turn to You more fervently,
bound in gratitude

*because You set the succession of seasons
change the day's divisions,
arrange the stars in the sky,
create day and night...*

And A. M. Klein's query:

O incognito God, anonymous Lord,
with what name shal I call You? Where shall I
discover the syllable, the mystic word
that shall evoke You from eternity?
Is that sweet sound a heart makes, clocking life,
Your appellation? Is the noise of thunder, it?
Is it the hush of peace, the sound of strife? (p. 257)

Hillel Zeitlin's song of nature to God (p. 44), and Hillel Bavli's prayer to live life to its fullest in every respect (p. 412), are quite modern and pertinent, if not so radical. There are also two prayers by R. Nahman of Bratslav, one for family peace and one for world peace, which, by simply and persuasively identifying peace with God and God's purpose, give it a cosmic, and not merely interpersonal, significance (pp. 162, 198). These few prayers, alone, point the way to a possible rejuvenation of prayer as such. It is a modest beginning, but in this area we are well advised to move slowly and be sure that the little we have achieved is sound.

The 1972 Maḥzor also breaks new ground in the matter of structural reorganization of the prayer format. It is most successful in the introductory parts of the morning service. It begins by replacing *Ma tovu* with Psalm 15, an excellent idea in itself, which is spoiled by a didactic, condescending translation ("Do we deserve to enter God's sanctuary? How can we merit a place in His Presence?"). This is followed by Luria's "I hereby take upon myself the command of my Creator: Love your neighbor as yourself." *Rofei kol basar* leads right into *birkhot hashahar*, and the blessings of the Torah are postponed, to be integrated with *Kaddish derabanan*. Numbers 6.24-26 is replaced with the far more pertinent Leviticus 19.1, 14-18, which is, unfortunately, reduced to platitude by the omission of phrases like, "Reprove your neighbor, but incur no guilt because of him. You shall not take vengeance or bear a grudge against your kinsfolk." R. Ishmael's Thirteen Principles of Interpretation

are mercifully interred, and in their place are inserted pertinent selections from the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin* 4.5, *Yoma* 8.9). *Psukei dezimrah* occurs in two versions, the one unabridged in Hebrew only, the other abridged with a helpful introduction and some superior translations. (The translation of Psalm 150 is an Elizabethan sonnet.) Ibn Gabirol's *Shahar avakeshkha* is transferred (restored?) to where its last line (*al ken odkha beod tihyeh nishmat eloha bi*) blends fittingly into *Nishmat*.

From there, the service proceeds untampered (except for the regrettable omission of Psalm 130) until *Oseh hashalom*. Good alternatives are offered for *Elohai nezor*. The reader begins the repetition of the Amidah—and there the real mischief occurs.

Heinrich Heine remarked, in his explanation of the difference between Hellene and Nazarene, that Ludwig Börne was unable to understand how anyone, on first arriving in Paris, could want to see anything other than the monuments of the French Revolution. Heine himself, on arriving in Paris, went straight to look at some manuscripts of medieval poetry; to Börne, this was a betrayal of revolutionary commitment. We have, in Börne, the archetype of Nazarene asceticism, which has no place for esthetic appreciation but wants to subordinate everything to the pursuit of ethical goals. It would dismantle a cathedral and parcel it out for the construction of small chapels, if some ethical goal were thereby served.

The traditional Maḥzor is just a cathedral, in Gothic or Baroque style, which, on close examination, yields smaller structures within larger structures. The basic structure, of course, is of four “services” each day (five on Yom Kippur), plus introductory prayers and *Kriat Shema*. Within each service, however, there are the seven *berakhot* (nine on Rosh Hashanah at *Musaf*), and each *berakhah* becomes expanded in the reader's repetition to include various *piyyutim* (each with a strict structure of its own), in such a relation to each other and to the service as a whole as to transform the familiar basic service into a unique entity expressive of the grandeur of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. The balance of *berakhot* within the *Amidah* is altered drastically: the *kedushah*, two lines in the daily service, receives the *uvkhen* paragraphs, and from there on, *uvkhen* becomes a leitmotif to introduce additional material, until the slenderest of the *berakhot* expanded into the grandest affirmation and praise of God, the Holy King.

What has happened to this structure in our time can be seen, in geometric progression, by noting the reduction in the number of *piyyutim* in the Yom Kippur *Shaharit*, for instance, from twenty-seven in the Adler Maḥzor, to nine in the Bokser Maḥzor, to three in the Maḥzor of the Rabbinical Assembly, or from eleven to four to zero, in the Yom Kippur *Musaf* before *Unesaneh tokef*. Features such as the contrast provided by the *Melekh evyon* paragraph in *Melekh elyon*, or *Maasei enosh* in *Maa-*

sei elohenu, are lost. What is lost above all, however, is the impact of the totality, which can no more be analyzed into its components than a symphony can be explained in terms of the character of a single theme.

What is added, instead, is a series of short supplementary readings entitled "Reflections" between each silent Amidah and the reader's repetition. These deal mainly with repentance as an ethical and religious problem, and they range from beautiful midrashim, through existentialist rhetoric, to dull didacticism, with generally more good than bad. They are a worthy addition to the service, but they do not compensate for what has been lost. It is good and necessary to improve our ethical understanding, but if we view the prayer service as just another Musar lesson, the effects will be disastrous for our prayer, and not altogether salutary for our Musar, either. To experience God's infinitude and our finitude, an affective, rather than an intellectual, approach is required, and we should concern ourselves with more than merely ethical propositions. But once we have had that experience, we shall have something more to bring to our ethical concerns as well. Here is another polarity in which satisfying the just claims of the members independently is prerequisite to their creative symbiosis.

We must be increasingly on the lookout, in this age of creative liturgy, for prayers which are not prayers, but only lessons in disguise. Psalm 15 is a prayer, but the Maḥzor's translation of it is a lesson in disguise. The same holds true of R. Abraham Danzig's prayer, which reiterates "You have created in me," which, however, is always rendered, "I have been created with" (pp. 346-349). In the Seliḥot, we find R. Abraham ben Samuel's "Whom can I accuse . . . when I have spilled my own blood?" (p. 394)—certainly a prayer in the thirteenth century, and possibly still a prayer for some today, but far more likely to read like a lesson; also Zeev Falk's "All the vows . . . of last Yom Kippur did not change our way of life" (p. 398)—a lecture, pure and simple; and Anthony Hecht's "Merely to have survived is not an index of excellence" (p. 402)—good as edification, not to be taken as more.

The procedure followed by the new Maḥzor will be defended on the grounds that the *piyyutim* are mostly incomprehensible to the vast majority of congregants, whereas the new "Reflections" at least offer them something of value that is readily accessible. Indeed, one can be grateful that that pedantic labyrinth of *melizah* and allusions, the *Amiz koah* in the Avodah, has been replaced with a historical introduction in English and readings from Mishnah Yomah. But that points up exactly what could have been done with the Amidah but was not done: to retain the original structure, while replacing its component parts with creations of similar content and character but greater clarity and pertinence. To be sure, to accomplish that with the Maḥzor, as a whole, is a task for generations. In the meantime, we cannot allow the ignorance of the present

generation to force our hand to consign to oblivion what took millenia to develop.

Nor should we allow a fashion of gore and filth and brutality to sully the purity of the holiest day of the year. The new *Eileh ezkerah* begins: "Of steel and iron, cold and hard and numb, now forge yourself a heart and come to walk the world of slaughter." Bialik showed here his understanding of the debilitating effect of preoccupation with atrocity, and he certainly did not intend that his descriptions of mutilated bodies and children torn apart find their way into a Maḥzor. Certainly there are far more sensitive and ennobling ways to present the unfathomable mystery of the Holocaust, by focusing on the heroism of the victims (*Tavalnu et besarenu* is included, because it is by now canonical), on the humanity of those who suffered and died and how *they* regarded their persecutors, on the moral failure of mankind by which they became capable of sinking to such abysses of horror. We are presented instead with an *Al het* in which we confess *our* guilt for the Holocaust—ours indeed! In what moral confusion such a procedure involves us! Either such a burden of guilt makes us so chauvinistically hypervigilant on behalf of Jewish interests, that every individual who opposes the interest of any Jew in any context becomes, *ipso facto*, an anti-Semite and the object of our eternal wrath; or, else, we involve ourselves in a "theological rationalization"—certainly only omnipotent God could cause the petty sins of "overcautiousness," "senselessness," "despairing," "being patient," and "frivolity" to result in the death of six million persons. As to what kind of sin and what kind of guilt *did* cause the Holocaust, this would be an enlightening inquiry, indeed, into the moral nature of man, and quite an appropriate matter for Yom Kippur, as well as more consistent with the ethical emphasis of the 1972 Maḥzor.

Why has the 1972 Maḥzor discarded good tradition in favor of bad change? Because, for years, Conservative Judaism held to Tradition as a principle, to be tempered now and then with Change, without properly examining the many separate virtues which underlay the vitality and richness of the tradition. Dissatisfied with the results of its program to date, it can see no other solution than altering the Tradition-Change balance in favor of more Change. But these are not the real issues at all. The real issues are ethical concern, esthetic grandeur, religious reorientation, retaining our sanity in a mad world, and learning—contantly learning—more about ourselves, our heritage, and our present situation, and how all three can be wrought into a higher synthesis.

Reactions to the Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor

SIDNEY GREENBERG

IT WAS SOLOMON SCHECHTER WHO MADE THE crisp distinction between two of the great Jewish classics. He pointed out that the Bible contains God's revelation to man, while the Prayerbook contains man's self-revelation to God. In the Siddur, the Jew has revealed his most intimate hopes, his strivings, his profoundest yearnings, his most fervent affirmation. In it, his heart and soul are bared as in no other work that he has created.

Moreover, the Prayerbook offers, not only an unparalleled insight into the spirit of the Jew, it also mirrors his history. It provides a faithful panorama of the towering events of all the centuries of Jewish experience. The Exodus and the exile, the splendor of the Temple and its destruction, the victory of the Hasmoneans and the pillage of the Crusaders—these are only some of the major highlights of the Jewish drama enshrined in its pages.

The Siddur was able to absorb and record these diverse moments and moods because of its unique and distinguishing characteristic—its openness. Unlike the Bible, which was canonized and closed, the Prayerbook remained ever receptive to new prayers. Abraham Millgram has accurately described it as “the looseleaf classic of the Jewish people.” It is this special quality which has conferred upon the Siddur a relevance and a timeliness which equipped it most admirably to serve the genuine spiritual needs of every generation.

It seems incredible, therefore, that more than a quarter of a century was to pass after the *Shoah* (the Holocaust), and close to a quarter of a century after the rebirth of Israel, before the Conservative Movement created a High Holy Day Mahzor which would reflect these monumental and climactic events in our history. Perhaps our people were too dazed by the former event and too dazzled by the latter to react more spontaneously. Or, perhaps, it is in the nature of rabbinic organizations to move ponderously, especially where diverse philosophies and perspectives have to be harmonized. Whatever the reason for the delay, it has at last been terminated with the appearance of the new Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur—*A Prayer Book For The Days Of Awe*, edited by Rabbi Jules Harlow. This Mahzor was well worth the waiting.

SIDNEY GREENBERG is Rabbi of Temple Sinai of Philadelphia and has put out several books of liturgy.

It is a truly beautiful volume. From an esthetic point of view, it is unrivaled among liturgical volumes. In a paper entitled "On Editing a Prayer Book,"¹ Rabbi Harlow dwelt upon the importance of the principle of *hiddur miṣvah* as it applied to the physical composition of the Maḥzor. A very serious and thoughtful effort was made to produce as attractive volume as possible. Towards this end, a variation of purple (*t'khelet*, suggesting royalty) together with the black, was used in the print. Every page is bordered by a thin purple line, constituting a frame, outside of which is a generous blank margin. Thus, a feeling of spaciousness is created, a feeling that is reinforced by the many pages which are only half filled because the editor was reluctant to begin an important prayer in the middle of a page. In addition, there is a completely blank page at the end of each important section of the service and, also, at the conclusion of each individual service.

The purple color is also used in the instructions to the congregation, in the rubrics and in the devotional introductions which precede many of the prayers, as well as for the special prayers which are added only on Shabbat. This latter device eliminates the use of brackets and, thus, enhances the attractiveness of the page. The purple is also used for numbering and for the running heads on each page. All in all, this addition of another color is a welcome innovation.

The contribution which the new Maḥzor makes to Jewish religious experiences goes far beyond the physical format. At untold points, the creative approach to the traditional text is apparent. Some instances, both in the text, the notes, and the translation, will be noted below. The critical observations which follow are made in a spirit of gratitude for what is being offered, and in the hope that future editions will carry forward the unending creative task of making prayer a vital experience.

The rubrics referred to attempt to capture the essence of the prayer which they precede. Thus, *Elohai neshamah* has a simple rubric reading, "We are grateful for the gift of our soul." The *Shema* is preceded by the words, "We formally affirm God's Sovereignty, freely pledging Him our loyalty. We are His witnesses." However, there is an inconsistency in the use of rubrics. Some prayers have them; others do not. Thus, *Yishtabah* has one to introduce it, but *Nishmat* does not. Neither does *L'el oreikh din*, or even a prayer as significant as *Unetanneh tokef*, which is preceded only by the reminder that "the Ark is open and the congregation rises."

A notable inconsistency in the rubrics is the inequality of their length on the Hebrew and English sides of the page. Very frequently they are identical on both sides but, often, the English side is longer (cf. pp. 2-21, 22-23, 24-25). A further inconsistency—the same prayer

1. Jules Harlow, "On Editing a Prayerbook," *Conservative Judaism*, Fall, 1971.

may have identical rubrics in one location and unequal ones when it appears elsewhere in the Maḥzor (cf. pp. 22 and 116).

Most of the time, the devotional introductions succeed admirably, but they are not uniformly successful. Thus, the translation of the Mourner's Kaddish (p. 51) is preceded by the statement: "In recalling our dead, of blessed memory, we confront our loss with faith by rising to praise God's name in public assembly, praying that all men recognize His Kingship soon." The two parts of this sentence—one dealing with faith in God and the other with the hope that men will accept God's sovereignty—are not related and are awkwardly linked in a single sentence. There are other instances, but we will not belabor the point.

Another important feature of the Maḥzor is the use of notes to interpret the high points of the liturgy in an inspirational manner. Thus, there are notes on the Kaddish, the Shofar, the three major divisions of the Musaf service, Kol Nidrei, the covenant of compassion, and fasting.

Welcome as these notes are, they are not altogether satisfying, for a variety of reasons. For one thing, why restrict them to only these six areas? Why is there no comment on the *Shema* or on any of the High Holy Day Bible readings or on *Unetanneh tokef* or on the *Neilah*, or the *Avodah* or on the martyrology section, to name only some of the omissions? These are all the more conspicuous because the Silverman Maḥzor,² now in almost universal use in Conservative congregations, does, indeed, have explanatory notes on these portions of the service.

The position of the notes in the Harlow Maḥzor is also subject to question. Those on the Shofar, the Musaf service and on the three major sections of the Musaf service are located at the very opening of the Maḥzor, immediately following the preface. It would seem to me that these notes would be much more helpful if they preceded the specific prayers which they are designed to illuminate. In their present position, they seem to be virtually wasted, because it is unrealistic to expect the worshipper to go searching for a note on the Shofar when the time for its sounding arrives. Nor is any clue provided, at the Shofar service, of the existence, much less the location, of such a note.

The note on Kol Nidrei evades the real problems historically associated with this prayer. Nor are all the notes equally effective. Other notes lack clarity and precision and are difficult to follow. In still others, there are stylistic weaknesses. Thus, in the note on the Shofar we find this sentence, "For you cannot attain (sic) to God by artificial means or by artifice." The *Zikhronot* note affirms that "on this awesome day no Jew stands alone before His King and Creator. Each Jew is a link in the unbroken chain that stretches from Abraham to the present moment. This gives us hope and comfort in God the King and Judge who 're-

2. *High Holiday Prayer Book*, compiled and arranged by Rabbi Morris Silverman (Hartford: Prayer Book Press, 1939).

members the covenant.' " It is by no means clear how being a link in the chain provides hope and comfort.

Another area which requires attention is the preface, which I found singularly ungratifying. It does not contain any indication of the motivations behind this massive enterprise and expenditure. Conspicuously missing is the kind of embracing statement of principles and procedures included in the foreword to the Sabbath and Festival Prayer Book issued by the Rabbinical Assembly and the United Synagogue in 1946. There a philosophy was expounded, which found its expression in the work at hand. The statement was crucial, not only to an understanding of the Siddur, itself, but, also, for an insight into the theology of the Conservative Movement of which a prayer book is, of course, a prime expression. It would have been helpful to have included some such statement in this High Holiday Maḥzor which appears twenty six years later.

Rabbi Harlow tells us that "Our editorial approach demands not only a new translation but editing the Hebrew text . . ." (p. v), but he does not indicate why a new translation was necessary and what principles guided the translators. Again, how and why was the Hebrew text edited?

The brief preface advises us that "The Yizkor service is printed preceding Neilah, and the Avodah service appears at the end of the Musaf." But there is not the slightest indication of the reasons behind this change in the geography of the prayer book.

In the note on the Kaddish, the following sentence appears rather casually: "In Jewish tradition such an act, (hallowing the Name of God) to have significance, must take place in public assembly, which is defined as a minimum quorum of ten adults" (p. 4). The implication seems to be that the official Rabbinical Assembly Maḥzor is prepared to count women as part of the minyan. If so, the position should have been affirmed quite explicitly in the preface and not left as a probable inference which could easily escape notice.

While we are dealing with "sins of omission," one or two others can be noted. Comparisons with the Silverman prayer book are inevitable. I miss, in Harlow's prayer book, the three poetic stanzas which, in Silverman's, follow the Kol Nidrei, and that do so much to interpret the stirring historical role which that prayer has played in Jewish history. Again, in the service of the sounding of the Shofar before the Musaf, I miss the poetic interpretations in Silverman which not only break up the continuous sounding of the Shofar but, also, give the ritual an ethical and moral meaning.

On the credit side, among the most commendable additions are the sections entitled "Reflections," following each Amidah which is traditionally repeated. Each group of Reflections runs from five to seven pages, and their themes are intimately related to the themes of the serv-

ices in which they are found. They are drawn from the Bible, the Talmud, and the Midrash, from medieval Jewish moralists and philosophers, Hasidic teachers and modern Jewish essayists, from poets and philosophers of diverse religious schools, and of no religious schools. The "catholicity" of the choice helps to convey the feeling that what we have here is not merely the Maḥzor of the Conservative Movement but the Prayerbook of the Jewish people.

The dominant impression that these Reflections leave is that they have been selected most judiciously and painstakingly. That one may not always concur with Rabbi Harlow's taste is to be expected. I question, for example, the inclusion of the passage from Martin Buber on page 273. I do not understand what Buber is saying there, and I suspect that neither will very many of the worshippers. Happily, this passage is not typical. For the most part, the Reflections can serve to deepen the impact of the worship experience and to expand the meaning of the Holy Days. They also lend themselves very well to study periods. Used imaginatively, at intervals during the service, they could offer a welcome change of pace, introduce variety and, perhaps, if one may utter such heresy, even provide a meaningful substitute for the sermon.

On the other hand, one of the things that I found more than a little disconcerting about the Reflections is the failure to list their authors, either following the passages or in a footnote on the page. On a single page of Reflections there may be as many as six paragraphs listed consecutively with no indication that they are by different authors, or who those authors are. If the reader is extremely curious, he must start searching in the back of the volume, and then, by some kind of count, try to determine which name belongs to which selection on the page.

Incidentally, the identification of the authors in the back of the Maḥzor is very sparse. All we are told about Hillel Zeitlin, for example, is "(1871–1943), Russia and Poland" (p. 784). Had the editor amplified a little by adding a phrase like, "He was one of the Jewish martyrs in the Nazi period," the impact of this excellent and moving poem would have been magnified. A descriptive phrase about each of the authors would, in itself, add to the educational value of the Maḥzor.

* * *

There is an inherited suspicion of the translator and a denigration of his work which is almost proverbial. The Latin stigma *Traditore-traduttore* (every translator is a traducer) haunts every practitioner of the craft. If he looks to Jewish sources for guidance he will be no better off. On the one hand, he will be told "*Ein mikra yozei midei p'shuto*—the text cannot be denied its literal meaning."³ But if he follows this

3. *Shabbat*, 63a.

maxim faithfully, he runs the risk of offending Rabbi Judah, who taught that "Whoever translates a verse literally is a liar and whoever adds to it is a blasphemer."⁴

One can, therefore, sympathize with Rabbi Harlow's lament: "Translation in general, and especially translation of the prayer book, is an exercise in frustration and failure. One of the ways to maintain emotional and intellectual balance while engaged in the exercise is to attempt to limit one's failure as much as possible. I hope that we have done so."⁵

I believe that Rabbi Harlow has, indeed, succeeded admirably and that his translation, on the whole, makes the Maḥzor more readable, intelligible, and pleasurable. Because he was not intimidated by Rabbi Judah's admonition against adding to a verse, Rabbi Harlow makes a vital contribution, for example, to our understanding of the prayer of the High Priest for the inhabitants of the region of Sharon. We are told that he would pray, "that their homes not become their graves." In the translation, the meaning of this prayer is clarified by the editor's informing us that the Sharon inhabitants "lived in peril of sudden earthquakes."

Rabbi Harlow showed both courage and imagination in his translation of *Ashamnu*. Instead of striving for literalness, he disregarded the Hebrew entirely and created a confessional acrostic following the English alphabet. "We abuse, we betray, we are cruel..." Thus, he conveys in English the same intent as in the Hebrew. Our sins are endless; there is one for every letter of the alphabet. Our confessional concludes only because we run out of letters, not out of sins.

Another important illustration of the same creativity at work is reflected in Rabbi Harlow's treatment of *V'khol ma-aminim*, composed by the Palestinian *paytan*, Yannai. The sixth century theology of the original, handicapped further by the demands of an alphabetical acrostic, is, in places, an embarrassment to the modern worshipper, as well as to rabbis who venture to read the *piyyut* in translation. In this Maḥzor, the alternate lines are the editor's interpretation of the implications of the author's affirmations. Every "we believe" (surely much to be preferred, in our skeptical age, to "all believe") is followed by a "therefore." The result is an impressive catalogue of cherished truths expressed in the modern idiom, which are at the very heart of the High Holy Day worship and of the Jewish tradition.

A vital contribution towards the enhancement of the readability of the Maḥzor is the use of "You" in addressing God and the elimination of "thee" and "thine" entirely, whether addressed to God or to man. The elimination of the archaic pronouns also signals the happy departure of "didst," "givest," "inclineth," "providest," which helped, among

4. *Kid.* 49a.

5. Harlow, *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

other things, to make any previous Maḥzor seem remote and archaic.

Unhappily, the editor could not resist a sixteenth century English translation of Psalm 150 by Mary Herbert, the Countess of Pembroke, but this mistake, I hasten to assure the reader, is a lone exception. Perhaps it was included to remind us how translations used to sound. In fact, when the Psalm appears again in the Rosh Hashanah Musaf, the English is more prosaic and more intelligible, the editor apparently having repented of his momentary lapse of judgment.

A further objection that I would voice on the translations is the repeated change of person. Thus, the Torah blessings are rendered, "Praised are You . . . who *has* chosen us" and "who gives" instead of "who have" and "who give" (p. 167). *Ahavat olam* concludes: "Never take away Your love from us. Praised are *You* who loves *His* people Israel" (p. 21). The transition within a single sentence is especially awkward. *Hashkivenu* concludes with "Praised are You, Lord who spreads a shelter of peace over us, over all *His* people Israel and over Jerusalem" (p. 27). Such a slavish faithfulness to the original jars the English reader.

The translation suffers, too, from internal inconsistencies. In the *berakhah* before the Haftarah (p. 181), *baḥar* is translated "loved"—"who has loved good prophets." The traditional translation for *baḥar*—"chosen"—seems much more appropriate. The next phrase, *Virazah vidiurehem hane'emarim b'emet* is translated "messengers of truth whose teachings He has upheld." Apparently, *razah* is being rendered as "upheld." And yet, *r'zeh* in the Amidah is translated "accept" (p. 37), and *r'zeh bimnuḥatenu* in the Sabbath prayer is likewise translated "accept our offering of rest" (p. 35).

Again, *oz hit'azar* is translated "robed in might" (p. 261), but *Adonai oz l'amo yiten* is rendered "may the Lord grant His people dignity" (p. 291). I suspect that this change in translation of *oz* may be deliberate. Rabbi Harlow may feel more comfortable asking for Jewish dignity rather than for Jewish strength. But in a Maḥzor containing so many vivid reminders of the terrible price paid for Jewish weakness, we ought have no compunctions about praying for strength for our people.

In the translation of *V'ahavtah*, the "frontlets" have, happily, disappeared and are replaced by "a reminder above your eyes." At least this is so in the Shema of Maariv (p. 23). In the morning Shema, the *totafot* are not a "reminder" but a "symbol" (p. 117). Speaking of the tefillin, we are still being urged to "bind them as a sign upon your hand." Since, in practice, they are bound upon the *arm*, could not the translation be adjusted accordingly?

Shem, in Hebrew, as we know, means "essence" and, therefore, need not be translated as "name" or, for that matter, be translated at all. Thus, *Barukh shem k'vod malkhuto l'olam va-ed* is correctly translated as though *shem* were not there. "Praised be His glorious sovereignty

throughout all time" (p. 23). *Shimkha me-olam over al pesha* is properly rendered: "You always forgive transgressions" (p. 579). Again, *N'kadesh et shimkha ba-olam* emerges as: "We proclaim Your holiness on earth . . ." (p. 143). However, in the Kedushah of Musaf, *shem* is translated. "We hallow Your name as celestial choirs hallow Your name" (p. 726).

There are several translations which appear questionable. *Ki va lishpot ha-arez* is translated: "He comes to sustain the earth," though the context would hardly support such an uncommon translation of *lishpot*. *Yam Suf* is translated "Red Sea" (p. 45). Certainly, by now, the "Red Sea" should have been consigned to the well documented oblivion which it deserves. In the first line of *Nishmat*, the phrase *v'ruah kol basar ti-faer* is rendered, "The force that drives all flesh exalts You" (p. 103). To speak of a force exalting God is hardly felicitous. The older and more obvious translation, which renders *ruah* as "spirit," appears much more appropriate. Nor, it would appear, has anything being gained by translating *binafsho yavi lahmo*, "He spends his life earning bread," (p. 243). The context requires some expression of life's futility and difficulty, and a preferable rendition would be: "He earns his bread at peril to his soul," or "He imperils his life for his daily bread."⁶

The fervent hope in the latter part of *Aleinu*, *v'yikablu kulam et ol malkhutekha*, is rendered: "May everyone accept the rule of Your Kingship" (p. 49). The Hebrew *ol* means "yoke," and to accept a yoke suggest a sense of submission, self-discipline and self-surrender. None of these qualities are captured in the rather bland "rule."

An opportunity was missed to eliminate an old mistranslation in the famous passage by Rabbi Elazar from *Berakhot* (64a) which follows *Ein keloheinu*. The play on the second *banayikh* to read *bonayikh* should be translated, not "builders," but, from the root *binah*, which means "understanding." This, of course, explains the verse in Isaiah that is being interpreted: "When all Your children are taught of the Lord, great will be the peace of those among you who possess understanding." Otherwise, the passage does not make sense in this context.

V'tehezenah eineinu b'shuukha l'zion biraḥamim is translated, "May we bear witness to Your merciful return to Zion" (p. 281). Obviously, the original means "may we witness." "Bearing witness" is an entirely different concept. One can understand the problem of praying for God's return to Zion in the 1970's, after Jerusalem has been unified, but I question whether this particular translation, which is unfaithful to the Hebrew, is the solution to the problem.

In this context it is worth noting that the *piyyut* of the tenth century Rabbi Ammitai ben Shefatiah, *Ezkerah elohim*, has been reworked to reflect contemporary historical realities. Of the original, only two

6. Cf. Max D. Klein, *Seder Avodah* (1960), p. 279.

first lines have survived, and these with a decisive change. Where the author mourned Jerusalem in its current devastation, the Harlow Maḥzor speaks of all this in the past. The editor then goes on to marshal verses from Deutero-Isaiah, celebrating Jerusalem rebuilt, and expressing the messianic hopes for an era of undisturbed joy and peace (p. 375). The reconstruction of this ancient dirge is one of the finest examples, in the Maḥzor, of bold and imaginative confrontation with a traditional text.

Regrettably, a similar boldness was not invoked in the second blessing of the Haftarah. There, we ask God to have mercy and to save Zion, who is *aluvat nefesh*, humbled in spirit. Here, Rabbi Harlow uses cleverness instead of courage. He places a period instead of a comma after *kee hee bet ḥayeinu*. Thus, the hope "And raise the humbled spirit soon" (p. 191) stands by itself and need not necessarily refer back to Zion. The problem has been evaded, not confronted. As one reads both the Hebrew and the English, the impression persists that the editor has tried to be more faithful to a happily outmoded text than to the new realities of our day.

It is worth noting that not all prayer books have the same phrase, *v'la-aluvat nefesh toshiya*.⁷ If different versions already exist, it is less radical to introduce still another, one required by Zion's redemption. The suggestion by Jakob J. Petuchowski⁸ that the substitute phrase read *u'lamkha Yisrael* (Your people Israel) strikes me as being especially good.

V'ne-e-man atah l'haḥayot metim . . . m'ḥayeh hametim is translated, "Faithful are You in giving life to the dead. Praised are You, Lord, Master of life and death" (p. 137). This translation departs from the Rabbinical Assembly Weekday Prayer Book, published in 1961, in which the conclusion to the second benediction of the Amidah is rendered both more faithfully to the Hebrew as well as closer to the suggestion of the hope for resurrection, "Faithful are You in bringing the dead to life again." The present translation dims the hope for resurrection and, thus, I believe, more accurately reflects the preponderant theological position of the Conservative rabbinate.

In *Umipnei ḥata-einu* some of the conspicuous virtues, as well as limitations of the Harlow Maḥzor, are brought into bold relief. Should the prayer have been retained at all? Can we honestly affirm that our long years of exile were a punishment for our sins—a doctrine advocated, often with pernicious intent, by a substantial segment of traditional Christianity? If our collective travail as a people is the result of prior transgression, shall we also look upon the Holocaust as the consequence of Jewish sinfulness? However noble it might have been of our ancestors

7. Y. Baer, *Seder Avodat Yisrael* (Tel Aviv, 1957), p. 227.

8. Jakob J. Petuchowski, "Conservative Liturgy Comes of Age," *Conservative Judaism*, Fall, 1972, p. 5.

to assume full moral responsibility for their misfortune and, thus, relieve God of capricious malevolence, we cannot repeat this prayer today without doing violence to our own theology, relieving the Nazis of their horrendous guilt and, by implication, imputing guilt to the Six Million.⁹

Having retained the prayer, the editor adapts it to reflect the new facts of Jewish life. In the first place, God is described as *Melekh raḥaman hameshiv banim ligvulam*, "who restores His children to their land" (p. 253). Notice that *melekh raḥaman* is not translated at all, but the existence of the State of Israel is clearly noted.

Towards the conclusion of the same prayer, another addition has been made, "be merciful to our brothers of the House of Israel who suffer persecution." This new note makes us vividly mindful of Klal Yisrael and the problems of those of our people who live in lands of oppression. Deleted from the prayer is the traditional lament: "We cannot perform our duties in Your chosen House, the great and holy Temple which was called by Your name on account of the hand that was stretched against Your sanctuary." This omission will scarcely be missed, but, interestingly enough, there does survive, in the Hebrew, a prayer that God will "renew" His "compassion for us and for Your sanctuary; enhance its glory." The hope for the restoration of the Temple here is inconsistent with the elimination of the prayer expressing that wish at the end of the Amidah. Moreover, the Hebrew of *Umipnei ḥata-einu* retains the phrase, *v'tivnehu m'herah*, which is omitted in the English.

This last observation raises the entire problem of whether we should retain any Hebrew which we do not see fit to translate into English. Is it that we ascribe different theologies to the worshipper in Hebrew than to the one who must use the translation? Or is it that we assume that our worshippers either do not understand the Hebrew or pay little attention to it?

This is by no means the only instance where there is a discrepancy between the Hebrew and the English. Thus, in the translation of *Unetanneh tokef*, God's throne disappears and, of course, He is no longer "seated upon it in truth" (p. 241). (It might be noted, incidentally, that the throne does remain in the translation of *mishkan k'vodekha*.)

In the *Hinneni*, several phrases are retained in the Hebrew but disappear without a trace in the translation. Satan is gone and so are the angels who transport the prayers. Untranslated, too, are two specific references to the people of Israel, as well as to the "God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob" (p. 237). The effect of this omis-

9. One of the most traditional rabbinic teachers at the Jewish Theological Seminary confessed, in a private conversation, that he cannot bring himself to recite *umipnei ḥata-einu*. His attitude is probably a truer reflection of the sentiments of his colleagues than is the retention of the prayer in the new Maḥzor.

sion is to make *Hinneni* a much more universal prayer than it was originally designed to be. If that is the editor's preference, he may be entitled to it, but the question remains, why should not the Hebrew and the English be brought into harmony?

* * *

Rabbi Harlow continues the tradition already accepted in Conservative liturgical works that we refer to the sacrificial system, not as a future hope but as a past memory (cf., p. 252). Indeed, Rabbi Harlow has now gone further. He has eliminated from the Biblical verses cited in the Amidah the references to the sacrifices and has indicated the omission by three dots (cf., pp. 225, 455, 570). Moreover, he has entirely eliminated from the Musaf Amidah for both Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur the passages from Numbers 29:1-6 and 29:7-11, respectively, which describe the sacrifices and offerings required on those days.

This reviewer would have liked to see Rabbi Harlow take one further step in that direction. Why not completely replace these same passages and suggest in their stead, or as alternative readings, Leviticus 23:23-25 for Rosh Hashanah and Leviticus 23:26-28 for Yom Kippur?

The Harlow Maḥzor has, in fact, made one such innovation. Just as the Reform and Reconstructionist prayer books have already done, this one provides an alternate Torah reading on the afternoon of Yom Kippur, along with the traditional one dealing with forbidden sexual unions. The alternate, from the holiness code of the nineteenth chapter of the Book of Leviticus, will surely be welcomed avidly and, in time, will probably be used more widely than the reading it is designed to replace. Conservative congregations have now seen this chapter "legitimized" and made accessible. This change gives us reason to believe that perhaps a future edition of the Maḥzor will offer two additional alternate Torah readings. ,

Rabbi Harlow has made some notable deletions and abbreviations in the Maḥzor. Most welcome has been the radical reduction of the quantity of *piyyut*. There is none at all before the Amidah in the Shaḥarit, and only a very few of the best known *piyyutim* have survived after the Amidah and in the Musaf. *Avinu malkeinu* now contains thirty verses, instead of the forty-four in the Silverman Maḥzor. (A sensitive touch, incidentally, is the constant repetition of the phrase *Avinu malkeinu* on the English side, without translation.)

There are two versions of the *Pesukei dezimrah*, the traditional one and a substantially abbreviated one. The line which precedes the traditional one refers the worshipper to "an alternate service" on a later page. It would have been more forthright to indicate that the alternate is abbreviated. Otherwise, why have an alternate service at all? There seems to be some reluctance to call too overt attention to the innovations.

The translation of the verses in the three major sections of the Musaf are designated "first day" and "second day," thus granting some kind of official dispensation to abbreviate the reading. (No similar dispensation is provided on the Hebrew side of the page.)

Gaal Yisrael in the Shaḥarit is followed by the observation, "Some congregations continue by reciting the Amidah led by the Ḥazzan, page 132." Here is tacit approval to the omission of the silent Amidah. (Similar instructions precede the Amidah for Minḥah on Yom Kippur.) Preceding the Amidah, itself, on the following page, there is a further note which advises the worshipper, "For reflections on themes of the day in English, see pages 128 to 131" (p. 124). Here is seemingly further endorsement for the omission of the silent reading of the Amidah in favor of the "Reflections." Another laudable abbreviation is in the long Haftarah for the first day of Rosh Hashanah, where the editor indicates three different places where it can be concluded.

The *Al het* for Yom Kippur has been sharply reduced. The Amidah of the Minḥah service preceding Yom Kippur and on Yom Kippur, itself, each have only six lines in the *Al het*. The Maariv and the Shaḥarit Amidot of Yom Kippur each contain only one *Al het* for every letter of the Hebrew alphabet, instead of the traditional two. Missing entirely is the section whose lines begin *V'al ḥataim* in which the various penalties for the sins are enumerated. An even more courageous innovation is an entirely new *Al het* "in memory of the six million" which is found in the Musaf Amidah. Here are some selections from that listing:

We have sinned against You and them by refusing to hear . . .
 We have sinned against You and them by useless conferences . . .
 We have sinned against You and them by not using our power . . .
 We have sinned against You and them by complacency . . .

Also worthy of note is the innovation at the conclusion of the Amidah, where we find a rubric saying: "At the conclusion of the Amidah personal prayers may be added before or instead of the following. . . ." These words are inserted before *Elohai n'zor*, which is designated for "first day" and is followed by another prayer designated for the "second day." The second prayer, tender and moving, is identified in the section on Sources in the back of the volume, "Adapted from a prayer in Sha'arei Tzion, Prague, 1662."

One of the most appealing qualities of the Maḥzor is the creative and imaginative use of Biblical and Talmudic texts to sustain and enrich the liturgy. Thus, at the conclusion of the Avodah service, we have a paraphrase of *Avot d'Rabbi Natan* (11a) in which Rabbi Joshua laments the ruin of the Temple and the destruction of the source and the instrument of atonement for the sins of Israel. Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Zakai comforts him by assuring him that, despite the destruction, atone-

ment is still available through deeds of loving kindness. Then there follows almost an entire page of ethical admonitions taken from traditional sources, urging us to be compassionate, charitable and loving in our relations with one another.

Special mention should be made of the original treatment of the thirteen attributes of God which are so central in the Yom Kippur liturgy. Both in the Hebrew and in the translation, the attributes are printed one to the line, and each is followed by its rabbinic interpretation:

THE LORD	I am He before you sin
THE LORD	I am He after you sin
GOD	merciful to all, Gentile and Jew
	etc. (p. 392)

As noted at the beginning of this review, this is the first Rabbinical Assembly High Holy Day Maḥzor to be published after the *Shoah* and the rebirth of Israel. It is extremely gratifying to feel the Maḥzor's responsiveness to these massive events. We have already dealt with some of the responses. A few others deserve mention. There is a special prayer for the State of Israel (p. 196). The Yizkor service contains an *El male*, "In memory of the six million," and asks a compassionate God to grant perfect peace "among the holy and pure; to the souls of our brethren, men, women and children of the House of Israel, who were slaughtered and burned" (p. 691).

Even when the *Shoah* is not openly mentioned, we hear its mournful echoes and we feel its assault upon our faith. Thus, the *Borkhu* of the Rosh Hashanah Maariv is preceded by a poem by Miriam Kubovy which was included, Rabbi Harlow tells us, "because it expresses an ambivalence in faith which many of us feel."¹⁰ We know the shattering cause of that ambivalence.

For the last, I have left the most terrible and most magnificent response to the *Shoah*—the martyrology section. It retains almost nothing of the traditional martyrology prayers that we have been reciting these many years. Instead, there are new selections from the Talmud dealing with the *Asarah harugei malkhut*, passages from Bialik's *City of Slaughter*, a powerful and sensitive poem by the late Hillel Bavli, a poem by a young boy who, we are told in the Maḥzor, was murdered at Auschwitz, a stirring poem by A. M. Klein, some lines from *O the Chimneys* by Nelly Sachs, and a seering, bold affirmation of belief, *Lamrot hakol*, by Sonia Morgenstern. These are followed by:

Because of the strength and the beauty and the piety of their lives,
because of our hope for the future which they have planted within us—
in spite of everything which strangles hope—we say Yes to creation and
we say Yes to our Creator and to His eternity and holiness.

10. Harlow, *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

יִתְגַּדֵּל

Kishinev

וַיִּתְקַדֵּשׁ

Warsaw

שְׁמֵהּ רַבָּא

Auschwitz

בְּעֶלְמָא דִּי בְּרָא כְּרַעוּתָהּ

Dachau

וַיִּמְלִיךְ מַלְכוּתָהּ

Buchenwald

בְּחַיִּיכוֹן וּבְיוֹמֵיכוֹן

Babi Yar

וּבְחַיֵּי דְכָל-בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

Baghdad

בְּעִנְיָא וּבְזֶמַן קָרִיב

Hebron

וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן.

יְהֵא שְׁמֵהּ רַבָּא מְבָרַךְ לְעָלְמָא וּלְעָלְמֵי עָלְמֵיָא.

יִתְבָּרַךְ וַיִּשְׁתַּבַּח

Kfar Etzion

וַיִּתְפָּאֵר וַיִּתְרוֹמֵם

Mayence

וַיִּתְנַשֵּׂא וַיִּתְהַדָּר

Terezin

וַיִּתְעַלֶּה וַיִּתְהַלֵּל

Treblinka

שְׁמֵהּ דְקֻדְשָׁא בְּרִיךְ הוּא

Bergen-Belsen

לְעֵלָא לְעֵלָא

Vilna

מִכָּל-בְּרִכְתָּא וְשִׁירָתָא

Usha

תְּשַׁבְּחָתָא וְנַחֲמָתָא

Massada

דְּאֶמִירֵּן בְּעָלְמָא

Jerusalem

וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן.

יְהֵא שְׁלָמָא רַבָּא מִן שְׁמַיָּא וְחַיִּים עָלֵינוּ וְעַל כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל,
וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן.

עוֹשֶׂה שְׁלוֹם בְּמִרוֹמָיו הוּא יַעֲשֶׂה שְׁלוֹם עָלֵינוּ וְעַל כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל,
וְאָמְרוּ אָמֵן.

The contemporary synagogue carries a vastly disproportionate share of the responsibility for preserving and transmitting our heritage and strengthening our collective will to live. With the simultaneous weakening of the Jewish home and the Jewish school, more than ever before is expected of the synagogue. All the greater, therefore, is the urgency that the synagogue be equipped with the best possible materials to discharge its sacred function in the most meaningful and most effective fashion. Seen in this light, the new Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor will surely be welcomed as a superb response to one of the truly crucial needs of our time.

The Enjoyment of Scripture: An Esthetic Approach

SAMUEL SANDMEL

I CAN REMEMBER WITH SOME VIVIDNESS MY FIRST encounter with the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch—in those days, the Hexateuch in the once widely used book by J. Estlin Carpenter. The experience for me was kindred to what Keats says about Homer:

Yet did I never breathe its pure serene
Till I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold.

Scripture and its scholarship were inextricably bound together for me, with Scripture on the one hand stimulating a constantly renewed, rewhetted curiosity, and the scholarship on the other so wondrously illuminating an ancient library that I found in it an attestation to the perception and profundity of the human mind and spirit.

In describing my *The Hebrew Scriptures*, I wrote: "This book is unabashedly a book of Higher Criticism." Yet I must confess to the growth of a certain uneasiness in the past years, an uneasiness which I hope I can delineate precisely. To begin with a negative, that uneasiness is not in any way a repudiation of Biblical scholarship, nor any dissent from its substance. To proceed to another negative, it has not been a rebellion prompted by the feeling that the theories were being over-extended and tediously belabored: for example, vassal treaty, amphictyony, and, indeed, form criticism. Rather, I have felt a sense of some dissatisfaction, some insufficiency even with what has seemed right. While yet remaining within the framework of the main thrust of that scholarship, the dissatisfaction grew, because, very simply, scholarship was no longer speaking to me in the terms in which, more and more, Scripture itself was speaking. Though not retreating even one inch from my unyielding commitment to the Higher Criticism, nevertheless, I found myself beginning to distinguish between the Higher Criticism and Scripture itself, and more and more I was viewing as somewhat separable and distinct what antecedently had been one single, fused element. The Higher Criticism was not helping me to respond to what Scripture was saying, and, in some senses, was obstructing such a response. Out of this inchoate dissatisfaction, there has now emerged a personal viewpoint which shapes my own present concerns about Scripture for which I would enlist the collaboration of sympathetic colleagues.

* * *

Respecting form criticism, Hermann Gunkel has written that the

SAMUEL SANDMEL is professor at Hebrew Union College-JIR.

scholar must constantly ask himself two questions: who is speaking, and to whom is he speaking? My own concern might be expressed in two entirely different questions: what is the Biblical writer saying, and, how is he saying it? Indeed, there is a closely related third question: how well or how poorly is he saying it?

Rather curiously, there is very little secondary literature on the purely esthetic side of the Hebrew Bible, and what does exist, usually on Ruth, Job, or Psalms, has often come from outside the realm of professional Biblical scholarship. Within scholarship—if a broad generalization is permitted—literary analysis ordinarily has dealt with the concerns of “Introduction”: where and when something was written, for what purpose, and whether the work is a unity, or discloses a composite authorship. The ordinary handbooks do, of course, discuss the characteristics of J, E, D, and P, but almost exclusively in terms of the theology or the issues of historicity, concerns I gladly acknowledge to be legitimate. As an example, the article on Deuteronomy in the *Interpreter's Bible Dictionary* is by Gerhard von Rad, a scholar of the highest rank. He provides, first, a summary of the contents; second, what he terms a “critical literary analysis,” devoted to excluding Chs. 32 and 33 from source D; next, a statement that the so-called D source results from a “not uncomplicated process”; a discussion of the implication of variations from singular to plural in the book; the likelihood that Chs. 12–26 represent a “combination of two Codices”; next, the relation between the “original Deuteronomy” and II Kings Chs. 22–23. Finally, the conclusion that “the oft-repeated laborious attempt to untangle the original Deuteronomy . . . was the pursuit of a phantom.” He concludes by saying that the need exists “to examine the many individual traditions which have been collected in Deuteronomy.” Von Rad gives us not one word of aesthetic criticism.

Now, we inherit Deuteronomy as a totality, and in this or that way it makes an impression on a reader. By common consent among modern scholars, Deuteronomy is a pseudepigraph; that is, some bold thinker and writer imagined himself Moses and he wrote Moses' farewell. Surely this was an astounding act of literary *huzpah*! What was this writer's conception of Moses—not as prophet, nor as law-giver, but simply as man? For example, cannot one legitimately wonder what was the reaction of Moses—whether the Moses of history or the Moses of literary creation—to the divine word that he was not to enter the promised land? Numbers 20:12 says this divine word went to both Moses and Aaron, but it completely abstains from indicating how the two responded. Do we not feel instinctively that something is amiss, that we are entitled to know whether Moses felt that his punishment was out of proportion to his misdeed, or whether he heard the news resentfully, or else resignedly? (When Aaron's sons—[Lev. 10:1–4]—die, we are told *vayidom Aharon* “Aaron was dumbfounded,” as NEB puts it.)

In contrast to Num. 20:12, Deuteronomy 1:37 portrays Moses as saying to the Israelites: "On your account, the Lord was angry with me also, and said 'You yourself shall not enter it but Joshua, son of Nun, shall enter it.'" In Deuteronomy 4:21-22, Moses says: "The Lord was angry with me on your account and swore I should not cross the Jordan or enter the rich land which the Lord your God is giving you for your possession." And in Deuteronomy 3:24, Moses relates that he threw himself on the Lord's grace and pleaded to be allowed to cross the Jordan and "see the rich land, the fine hill country in the Lebanon."

How historically reliable it is that Moses did such pleading is of no direct importance here; we are presented in Deuteronomy with that which I believe we miss in the passage in Numbers, the human factor, the understanding of the human heart. I am not saying at all that Numbers or, indeed, the first four books of the Pentateuch, are totally deficient, but noting only that at one point Deuteronomy satisfies us in a literary way, while in Numbers we are not satisfied.

I do not think that there is any great issue of history or theology at stake in the matter of Moses' pleading. What I do say is at stake is that the man, or chain of men, who wrote Deuteronomy, had some conception of human beings and how they act and how they respond, and that the Deuteronomist's determination to depict Moses as giving a farewell address or addresses meant that the character of Moses needed to be portrayed. I will not pause here to specify the richness of that portrayal, but only to record my wish that von Rad, in speaking of Deuteronomy in the literary sense, had said something along this line, instead of confining himself to the putative growth and development of the book.

The pages of the Hebrew Bible present us with a constant stream of human beings and a continuing series of incidents embodying conceptions and ideas, some purely secular and some involving the Divine; Is it not true to say that Biblical scholarship has dealt with the literature of the Bible as though it were almost anything but literature? I can personally no longer go on that way.

* * *

In my work in Hellenistic studies, I have had reason to encounter a goodly amount of what the Hellenistic rhetoricians told us about how one should write. I do not think it possible to grasp the first sentences in Luke without some awareness of Hellenistic rhetorical canons. I do not think we can comprehend what the Pastoral Epistles say in scoring genealogies and myths, or "Jewish" myths, without our noting the legacy of theories about writing inherited from the Hellenistic rhetoricians. With respect to the Hebrew Scriptures, on the other hand, nothing that I know of has come down to us on what the Hebrews regarded as good writing or poor writing. That they were aware of some classes of literature is evident from the first chapter of Proverbs, where there is a series of synonyms for

the *mashal*, the proverb. If we try to assess how the Hebrew authors wrote, and, especially, how well or, occasionally, how poorly they wrote, then we must do it on the basis of our own observation, and run the risk of anachronism, in being unconsciously influenced by our own age in setting up the standards by which to judge.

A useful point of departure is the narrative that begins I Samuel. From the start, until the point where the priest, Eli, scolds Hannah and prompts her reply to him, it takes only a page in the printed Hebrew Bible. One matter to note, then, is the relative brevity of Hebrew narration. This brevity stems, in part, from the absence of description. The Hebrew writer here tells us nothing about Hannah's appearance or her age or her way of walking. The sole item that he discloses is that Hannah is barren, while her rival has children. We can note here how relatively little of psychological inquiry is directly made; we are brought into the inner feelings of the characters by what they say and do, and not by what an author digresses to explore. He begins with an identification of Elkanah and of his home city, and, in relatively terse clauses, gives us the names of the two wives, telling us that Peninna has children while Hannah has none. He recounts that it was customary for Elkanah to ascend to Shiloh to offer sacrifices and to give portions to his family—to Peninna and all her sons and daughters many portions, and to Hannah only one, even though he has preferred her. Manifestly, we deal with an emotional situation; and, indeed, virtually all Hebrew writing is emotional rather than intellectual. Our sympathies are immediately awakened to Hannah so that we feel with her when her rival, Peninna, provokes her. We understand her inability to eat. We cannot help but be touched by the futile words of her loving husband when he reminds Hannah that he is better to her than ten sons. Quickly we are brought to the climax wherein Hannah prays silently, but with her lips moving, so that Eli thinks that she is a drunken woman and rebukes her. It is impossible not to be moved by her reply that she was only pouring out her heart to God.

There is clearly a tone to the story, and the word I would use to describe that tone is "poignant."

I have no idea whether this story is historical or not, and I do not see any particular theology in the story. I do see it as a gem of writing and would attribute to the author a very sure hand. I would ask us to note, parenthetically, that in the initial mention of the place Shiloh, the author tells us that there were present those two sons of Eli, Hofni and Phineas. I say "parenthetically," for this is indeed a parenthesis, a comment in passing that is designed to foreshadow things that will ensue. The Hebrew writer, in dealing with long narrations, was particularly aware of the desirability of foreshadowing.

I see no reason not to agree with the view that holds that the Deuteronomic author *incorporated* this story into his long writing. Whether he

borrowed it in its entirety, or whether he himself composed it is beyond my knowledge and really of no great concern. I am saying only that, on the mechanical side, this item about Hannah appears within a very long narration. Within that same narration, there are the five accounts of different judges, at least two of which, about Ehud and about Deborah, are short enough to fit in with the brevity of this story of Hannah.

I do not think that we will find the Hebrew manner of narration much different when we turn to the story of Ehud; what is significantly different is the tone. The account of Ehud is that of the clever lefthander who slays the exceedingly fat King of Moab. I do not hesitate to label the story of Ehud a very coarse one; I am not sure that the ancient Hebrews thought it so. I think, rather, that they saw rich humor in the manner in which Eglon is deceived. I think that to them it was very funny that Ehud is able to plunge not only the sword, but also the hilt, into the fatty belly of the king, and let the abdominal fluids ooze out. I think they found it very funny that the servants of Eglon, wondering why the interview with Ehud stretched out, attribute to Eglon a prolonged visit to what the British, in a euphemism, call the cloakroom. As far as brevity is concerned, the account of Ehud is scarcely a half-page. The description of him is limited entirely to the information that he is left-handed. Again the account moves quickly from beginning through climax to end.

I have stressed the word "tone" for two different reasons. One is that so adulated is Scripture that the modern age is quite unwilling to acknowledge in it, or in any sacred writings, elements of fear, anxiety, hatred, love, laughter, scorn, triumph, vindication, and defeat. The second is that tone is often the key to understanding and appreciation.

There are many rich comic sections in the Hebrew Scriptures, but how unwilling are modern people to admit that the comic is comic? The weasel word often chosen as a way out is "satire." In my judgment, the Book of Jonah is no less than a masterpiece. Its thrust could not be more serious than it is, but its tone and manner could not be more comic. Jonah, told by the Lord to go eastward by land journey to Nineveh and to inform the Ninevehites that if they do not repent they will be destroyed, takes a ship and goes westward. A storm comes up, and where is Jonah? In Gilbert and Sullivan, when the Lord High Admiral sings: "And when the breezes blow, I generally go below and seek the seclusion that the cabin grants," the audience does not hesitate to laugh. When we read the same kind of thing, much earlier than Gilbert and Sullivan, in Scripture, we manage to steel ourselves again laughing. And when the sailors throw lots to see who is causing the storm and it falls on Jonah and he is thrown overboard, not only does the storm subside, but the sailors begin to worship Yahweh. The author next faces the need to get Jonah to where he was in the beginning and, therefore, he has the big fish. Inasmuch as the fish swallows Jonah and the only fish we know of

in our time that is big enough to swallow a man is a whale, the fish has become a whale. I read somewhere a sober inquiry as to how it was that Jonah, in the body of the fish, resisted the flow of the digestive juices.

A second time Jonah is told to go to Nineveh and this time he does. Nineveh is a city so large—an ancient Los Angeles—that it takes him three days to traverse it and to make his proclamation. Once Jonah has done so, he succeeds in the mission on which he has been sent. But by one of the turns of genius on the part of the narrator, instead of Jonah's being happy that he has succeeded, he becomes exceedingly angry. With tremendous acumen, the author terminates the story with a didactic section: Jonah is under a gourd, which has come up in a day and has died in a day and he feels justified in being angry about it—so that he may be taught the lesson that God is concerned about men, women, and children, and cattle who endure longer than a day. To repeat, the thrust of the Book of Jonah could not be more serious than it is or more universalistic or more lofty. But its tone is that of good, rich, extravagant humor.

Even more skillful, though not nearly as profound nor nearly as significant, is the Book of Esther. To term it "satire" is to distort its nature. There is satire in it, respecting the manner in which protocol works in the Persian Court, but the book is a unique blend in which sheer, utter farce veers to become tremendously urgent and serious drama. It begins with great exaggeration, describing the majesty of the omnipotent king, who rules over 127 provinces, and who invites all the officials of all these provinces to Susa the capital, to a party beyond every other party. He exhibits all his wealth. Once the party is over, he gives another party for those who happen to remain there in Susa; now, rather slyly, the author tells us that the drinking is normal; nobody has to be forced. So the king gets tipsy and orders his consort, Vashti, to make an appearance. Powerful and rich as the king has been shown to be, Vashti refuses to come. No French farceur ever did better. The royal council is assembled and it gives the king the sage counsel that he must take drastic steps, for if the example of the queen is followed throughout the 127 provinces, all women will begin to disobey their husbands.

Sheer, utter farce is here presented with touches of literary genius. For example, when Mordecai discovers that two of the gatekeepers want to assassinate the king and he gets the word to the monarch, the matter is recorded in the chronicles. Later, when the king suffers from insomnia, the way in which he can fall asleep is to have somebody read him those royal chronicles. When the king demands to know if his savior has been rewarded, Haman enters the palace gate and the king puts to him the question—How shall the king reward one who has done him a kindness? Haman promptly thinks that it is he who is to be rewarded.

Most skillful of all, in Esther, is the way in which the author creates a succession of two scenes in which the heroine confronts the villain. The

first scene is only preparatory, for the author had a good sense of timing and did not want, as it were, to be too abrupt. Hence, the first dinner in the queen's boudoir leads to a second invitation. With dexterity, the author then turns to give a domestic scene between Haman and his wife, Zeresh, wherein Haman both boasts of his accomplishment and also expresses his anxiety about Mordecai. The climax comes in the next boudoir scene. At the very moment at which Esther denounces Haman to the king, the king feels the call of nature and must leave. We read, in Esther 7:7: "The king rose in his wrath from the drinking of wine, going to the garden of the palace. Haman arose to plead for his life with Esther the queen, for he saw that evil was closing in on him from the king." The king returns from the garden to the boudoir, with Haman fallen on the bed on which Esther is. The king says, "Are you trying to ravish the queen, with me in the house?" The same author, with so remarkable a gift for farce, is also able to write the words attributed to Mordecai and delivered to Esther: "Do not think that you will escape here in the palace any more than the rest of the Jews, and if help does not come from you, it will come from some other source." This veering between farce and utter seriousness anticipates a similar recurrent device in Shakespeare by some 2,000 years.

The literary manner in Esther is little different from that of any other prose in Scripture; it is, rather, the working out of a complicated plot, and, indeed, two levels of plot that mark this as a work of high originality. A book like Jonah or a book like Esther was not simply tossed off. Each account was artfully planned by an author who had both a mind and, also, great literary skill.

In longer works, such as the Deuteronomic Writings, the circumstance that varieties of sources were utilized by a later author, and that there is evidence of a succession of redactions (for example, the first edition of Kings probably terminated with Josiah and the second terminated with the death of Jehoiachin in Exile), dilutes, for some, the essential unity that artful writing should have. I believe that I recognize many, if not all, of these problems. I believe, too, that the Deuteronomic Writings, once a unity, underwent some later segmentations, so that, as a result, we get a view of a conquest under Joshua, and of a settlement in the period of Judges. Because of this segmentation, the basic unity has been somewhat dissipated, but I do not think that it has totally disappeared. We deal with different kinds of assembled and partially redacted materials. Certainly one needs to be aware of the pronounced accentuation on David, with the result that we have more material on him than on any other Biblical character. Here we can do little more than to hint at a few matters. If we include the Book of Deuteronomy with the sequences Joshua-Kings, what we have, in effect, is an effort to

compose an interpretation of history, covering a period of almost 1,000 years, from the standpoint of religious standards and criteria.

Perhaps unfairly I ask myself: How would someone today write a history of the American presidency, judging each president by some given standard of religious morality or fidelity? It is my opinion that the tremendous Deuteronomic conception is greater than the execution. The totality, so it seems to me, is a literary failure in that the parts are often greater and better than the whole. Thus, I know of no writing that for me has the impact of the terse account of David, Bathsheba, and Uriah. A setting of the scene, with the troops away besieging Ammon while David is in Jerusalem, reflects the sharpest of contrasts. The willfulness of the King, contrasted with the religious fidelity of Uriah, is surely as good an example of sardonic writing as one will ever find. With what skill the author points up the contrast when Uriah has declined to go home to Bathsheba, lest, by lying with her he became ineligible for the army, while neither David nor Bathsheba is very much concerned that her menstrual purification has not been completed. How sharply etched are the characters of David and Uriah and of the psychophant Joab! And how acute is the impact with which the author abruptly introduces the religious note at the end of a secular account with these words: "The deed which David had done was evil in the eyes of Yahweh!" How wondrously the episode is built into the sharp climax!

What raises the story of Absalom's revolt beyond a pedestrian account of the maneuverings in an oriental court is the repeated motif of David's love for his son. That the great warrior and king is unable to discipline the wayward son could make a fascinating story; that the account veers from the crushing of Absalom's revolt and his death to David's extreme grief—"O, Absalom my son, Absalom my son"—is surely a literary achievement of the greatest insight, skill, and even artistry.

On the other hand, many pages in the Deuteronomic Writings are pedestrian and downright dull. Worse than the dullness is what I think is a distortion of prophecy. Indeed, except for Nathan and Elijah, the Deuteronomic Writings are almost entirely manipulated, devoid of individuality, and their level of prophecy—for example, Elisha—is such that we need not admire them. I am quite unable to explain why the authors cite none of the literary prophets except Isaiah; perhaps it is because the inherited words of Amos or Hosea or Micah were not readily to be adapted to the calculated use of the prophets in these writings.

The issue of tone is, to my mind, at its highest when one deals with the Pentateuch. One should really say the Tetrateuch, for I accept the judgment of those who believe that the last portion of Deuteronomy has been moved from its former place at the end of Numbers.

The Tetrateuch is an artistic masterpiece. Not only is its conception profound and its execution in conformity with the conception, but both

the portions and the totality are of equal artistic value. All too often, in American universities, the Pentateuch is taught with an emphasis on J, E, D, P, to the point of the total neglect of the content. The various anomalies, which are truly present, in forms of doublets or triplets and contradictions and discrepancies, seem to usurp the attention that properly should be given to the content, and, indeed, to the question: what is the author saying, and how is he saying it? To the list of discrepancies that one can find in an older book, such as Driver's, there are those that I could myself supply, having extracted these from the rabbinic preoccupation with matters of chronology, and here the rabbis pick up some problems that modern higher critics, by chance, did not notice. Let it be clear that these problems are, indeed, present. The question needs to be asked, Do these problems interrupt the momentum of the account? To this I must answer resoundingly, No! For example, I do not think that the question of who went up the sacred mountain with Moses (Aaron, or Hur, or Dathan and Abiram or seventy elders) need startle us, nor upset us, for surely so important is Sinai that nothing is more natural than that there should be diverse traditions recorded.

Yet, in fairness to the Biblical author, I think one can adduce certain things that go on in writing today. Are articles submitted with inner contradictions? Are they submitted with repetitions? And with the footnotes numbered wrong? Why do modern publishers maintain copy-editors who check on the spelling and on the references and belabor an author with endless questions about why he did this and why he did that? The author of the Tetrateuch was, unhappily, not equipped with a modern, efficient copy editor. I am quite willing to attribute multiple hands to the Pentateuch but I must say that in my own writing, which is not inconsiderable, I have personally achieved quite as many bloopers as have the multiple authors of the Pentateuch. But is the Tetrateuch simply a collection of anomalies and errors? Is it simply a repository of four different sources, and nothing else?

In my mind, despite anomalies and contradictions, Genesis is crystal clear. The first account of creation was recognized as majestic in the Hellenistic world almost 2,000 years ago. An issue of tone arises in the so-called J account. With what misguided solemnity it is usually read! The verve and dash and humor with which it is written completely escape the modern reader. Traditional exegesis—sometimes Jewish, sometimes Christian—contributes its own distortion. Christians should be alert at this point to my Jewish prejudice; we Jews have never interpreted the Eden story as the fall of man. We have normally attributed that to Genesis 6. We also do not make it quite as resounding a fall! On the other hand, Jewish exegesis has had its own excesses, too, and I would judge that the virtues and trespasses of both side of exegesis weigh pretty much the same number of pounds. The Eden story is meant to be witty,

witty in the same way that Jonah is witty. It begins with a pun, that the serpent was *arum* and Adam and Eve were *arom*, “wise” and “naked.” Fun is poked at them on the supposition that one can become wise by eating a piece of fruit. They eat the fruit—how wondrously in the account they pass the buck!—but the sum total of their wisdom is that they are naked, so that they sew fig leaves for themselves and in the next chapter, God graciously sews leather garments for them.

The story of primeval man is wondrously arranged; of course, some editor could not resist his anti-Canaanite sentiment to the point that he has disrupted the story of Noah and his three sons by introducing confusion as to whether the second son is Ham or Canaan. Again, the author need not have postponed to the age of Noah the division of humanity into the residents respectively of Asia (Shem), Africa (Ham), and the Mediterranean Isles (Japheth). The author, though, knew of the tradition of a flood, a universal flood; he uses it, and it is after the flood that humanity becomes divided into its three continents as at Babel—again a humorous matter meant seriously! Then comes the origin of the Hebrews.

The Abraham material is largely a series of vignettes, a character sketch of the highest artistry about a respected, noble gentleman; the prevailing tone is that of dignity. Abraham comes to Canaan but he does not take possession of it; he builds altars, but he does not offer regular sacrifices. He is neither a beggar nor a pauper; he is able to protect his land from the eastern kings; he is faithful to Yahweh. A touch of real genius is to be found in Abraham’s abstaining from bargaining with Efron, the Hittite, over the price of a burial plot for Sarah, and his subsequent bargaining with the deity over Sodom. Notice that it is characteristic of Hebrew writing to present abstraction through the narration of concrete incidents; the saving idea of the power of the righteous is recorded as incident, not as a direct doctrine. In the Abraham material, the Biblical author ignores the recurrent theme of the pre-exilic prophets that the origin of the Hebrews was in the Wilderness; conceivably, his literary concerns forced him into a new perspective. His writing at a time when the Judaeans returned from the Babylonian exile prompted him into an incipient anachronism; he has Abraham born in Chaldea so as to leave it, just as the returning exiles had also left it.

Abraham is portrayed on a double level: he is the putative historic ancestor of the people, and he is also the exemplar for his people late in their history. The author writes as he does, not because he is ignorant of the past, but because he knows so much. He knows the Wilderness tradition, he knows the Exodus tradition, he knows of the monarchy and he knows the prophets and he knows of psalmists; he knows of the destruction of the northern kingdom and he knows of the Babylonian exile. Virtually all of these matters are present as nuances in the Abraham material. The author also knows that the neighboring peoples speak

kindred languages and have kindred ceremonies. He must account for the similarity and, hence, Abraham is the father of many peoples, including those born to him by Keturah, the least-known woman in Scripture.

The account of the binding of Isaac is surely the high point in the series of vignettes. Whatever else the other incidents contribute to the portrait of Abraham, it is the binding of Isaac that clarifies his character, in the literary sense.

The laconic statement in Genesis 11.30, "Sarai was barren; she had no child," is not just a statement of fact; it is no less than a motif which shapes the writing of the Abraham material. It lends profundity to ensuing materials. Without it, Genesis 15 would make little sense, and the pathos of Genesis 22 would almost disappear. The viewpoint of the rabbis that there is no pleonasm in Scripture is, *mutatis mutandis*, a valid principle of literary understanding. So bare is Hebrew narration that what is included necessarily has significance for an understanding of the esthetics of prose narratives. The barrenness of Sarah is an invitation to the reader to share in Abraham's emotions as the narrative unfolds. It comes so early in the account because it is so important in a literary sense.

How different the Abraham material is from the Joseph material! The Abraham material (as the ancient rabbis recognized) does not seem to follow a strict chronological sequence, but can be rearranged without great loss; indeed, one does not know whether the call to Abraham is supposed to have come at Ur or in Aram. In the Joseph novelette, however, rearrangement is totally impossible, for the author has so tightly constructed the narrative, that if one removes one incident, the totality collapses.

Isaac is a literary puzzle. Little is told of him beyond the incident with the matriarch in Gerar and the one about the name of Beer-sheba, both of which also occur in the account of Abraham, and one wonders whether the Abraham material was borrowed from the Isaac or the Isaac from the Abraham. My own guess is that the author had no more to tell us about Isaac than he gives us, or else he would have done so.

The Jacob of the Joseph novelette is a respected, austere gentleman. The Jacob of the Jacob stories is a lovable rogue, but still a rogue. We are here on one level in the realm of folklore not much different from that of Samson or Ehud or Elisha. What is most different is that the writing is more skillful. The picaresque novel of modern literature has its origin in the Jacob cycle. No character is quite as dull for literature as the righteous man; I have yet to read a good novel about an honest banker. It is the rogue who is fascinating for literary creativity. It is one thing, though, to tell pleasant tales about a rogue, and another thing to have that rogue as an ancestor. I believe it is not hard to discern the

manipulations in the Jacob stories which alter him, on another level, into the respected person he is in the Joseph story.

The Joseph novelette serves a purpose beyond its own worthy content. It harmonizes the discrepancy between the eastern origin of Abraham, as found in Genesis 11 and 12, and the Wilderness origin of the Hebrews found in the pre-exilic prophets. Moreover, the Joseph story accounts for the presence of the Hebrews in Egypt to foreshadow the enslavement for which the Exodus, so central in the prophets, is the sequel. The author has provided us with a literary conception of the origin of the Hebrews: a series of three solitary men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with Isaac only one of many children of Abraham; and Jacob one of two children of Isaac; but a direct line *has* been established. With Jacob and his sons, there is no longer need to distinguish between direct and indirect line, for all are in the direct line. They are the progenitors of the tribes and the forebears who provide a transition from solitary persons into a collective Israel. How skillfully and smoothly this is accomplished!

But the masterpiece in the Tetrateuch is the portrayal of Moses. That he almost perishes in enslavement and that his own mother is hired to be his nurse, constitute a pleasant child's tale. That he is raised in the palace, alienated from his people, prompts the double incident of his rescue of a Hebrew, and then of his repudiation by this same Hebrew, so that he must take flight to seek complete separation from his people in Midian. These matters, however, are what you might call, simply, the data. Beyond the data is the conception: When the Hebrews developed from three solitary people into the twelve sons of Jacob and then became a people, they as yet had no laws, no sacred calendar, no land of their own, and, indeed, they did not even know the name of the Deity to whom they were to be loyal. What Moses does is to take a raggle-taggle, formless, shapeless people out of enslavement and refashion them into an extraordinary people. The author deals basically with three characters: Moses, the children of Israel, and the Deity. He must proceed in such a way that the children of Israel, who are protagonists, are never the heroes; the Wilderness wanderings are, on the surface, an account of the *infamous* deeds of the Hebrews.

Note what it is that Moses, the architect of the Laws, of the calendar, the rites and ceremonies, must undergo: complaints, murmurings, disaffection, yearning for the fleshpots of Egypt, the incident of the golden calf, the Rebellion of Korah and the Reubenites, the maligning of his wife by his own brother and sister. The only title that Moses bears is "man of God." Not a king, not a ruler; Scripture describes him as humility itself.

What are the trespasses of the Hebrews listed above? Are they not the ordinary misdeeds of ordinary people? Is it so terrible to long for meat? Is it so terrible to want water when you are thirsty? What is it that

the Hebrews do that is wrong? The answer is that they do what ordinary people do. What the Biblical author is telling us is that Moses is fashioning them into a kingdom of priests and a holy people and, therefore, ordinary conduct is not good enough.

It is so easy to lose sight of the planning, the execution, the skill, the artistry, the tremendous fashioning of the Pentateuch. It is not so much the deeds of the Hebrews that are important, but the way in which these deeds are recorded in Scripture that makes them important. The recording becomes significant because the writers were men of utmost skill. Completely human, they had time to laugh, they had time to be outraged by violence, they had the foibles of occasional arrogance and parochialism and triumphalism, and yet they rose to set a standard and to establish criteria for ethical living that shaped civilization for good for hundreds, indeed thousands, of years. No event in Hebrew history is as important as the writing of the Pentateuch. It is worthwhile to master source analysis and tradition history and form criticism if only to see what a tremendous achievement is the writing of this book.

Chief in importance, however, is the literary conception itself. Respecting the latter, one cannot fault the Pentateuch. The inherent idea of tracing "history" is an exalted one. In execution, the characters are drawn with such fidelity to human beings that we are never at a loss to understand them. The stakes are high, never trivial. Sometimes incidents are a bit obscure, and sometimes we flounder in this or that tiny item. as, for example, the curious account of the circumcision of Moses' son in Exodus 4. Yet the over-riding skill is there. I sometimes wonder whether it is the holiness of the Pentateuch that has made it live as literature, and I suppose there is truth in that; yet I often think that it is the literary quality of the Pentateuch that has made it appeal to men as holy.

Is not this kind of inquiry—what the Biblical author as an author is saying and how he says it—an urgent necessity for us who are professional scholars? Is this not a chore as important as the admirable disciplines of tradition-history, form criticism, and efforts to solve the unsolvable problems of what is or is not accurate history? One man can possibly make a start; the fullness of esthetic appreciation can come only if many men would turn to it and refine and deepen the inquiry.

There is much I have left unsaid. How little I have spoken of poetry! I have said nothing of Wisdom Literature, of Job, of the prophets.

Let me, therefore, conclude with a question: Amos was a shepherd, a tender of sycamore trees. Presumably, he attended no school; presumably, he never had any higher education. How does it chance that he wrote such matchless poetry? How does it chance that that matchless poetry expresses such startling, stirring ideas? Here I can say little more than this, that the greatest miracle of all the miracles in Scripture is the wedding of lofty poetry and lofty ideas.

Jewish Militarism and Jewish Survival

JOSEPH SCHULTZ

THE INCREASING INTEREST, IN OUR TIME, IN THE Second Commonwealth period, is motivated by, among other things, the fact that the constellation of forces and the historic patterns of that period are, in many ways, strikingly similar to those operating in world Jewry today. The most obvious example is the existence of an independent Jewish State linked to a large Jewish diaspora by the powerful bonds of kinship and national pride. Despite the vast changes that have occurred in the centuries separating the Jewish world of the first century from its present day counterpart, there are elements which remain constant and provide an insight into the dynamic relationship between the Jewish State and the Jewish diaspora. A closer examination of the complex web of emotion, ideology and religious ideals in which the Jews of the Second Temple period found themselves enmeshed can illuminate the recurring patterns of Jewish history operating today, though in a different form and under drastically different conditions. In the words of the rabbis, *maaseh avot siman l'banim*, the history of the fathers often prefigures the history of their descendants.

The Hasmonean state arose against a background of martyrdom and religious persecution, and its twin heroes were the religious martyrs who passively died under Syrian-Greek hands rather than violate the Law, and the guerilla fighters captained by the Hasmonean family. Both images had an enormous impact on Jews in the diaspora as well as in Palestine. The author of *I Maccabees*, writing in the land of Israel, and the author of *II Maccabees*, writing in the Greek diaspora, dramatically describe the death of the Jewish martyrs and the military victories of the Hasmoneans which electrified the Jewish world. But it was the image of the fighting Jew which predominated. In the Roman-Jewish War of 66-70 C.E. and in the Bar Kokhba rebellion it was the undimmed memory of the Hasmonean soldier heroes which animated the Jewish resistance to Rome in both instances. Jews would no longer be passively slaughtered as were those pietists in the days preceeding the Maccabean revolt. As a last resort they would take their own lives, as did the defenders of Masada, rather than fall into the hands of the enemy.

This spirit of militant national pride also permeated much of Jewish life in the Greek diaspora. Philo expressed this sense of national solidarity in his citation from the letter sent by Agrippas to the Emperor Caius Caligula protesting the graven image which the emperor had or-

JOSEPH P. SCHULTZ is associate professor of Jewish History and Director of Jewish Studies, U. of Missouri, Kansas City.

dered erected in the Temple. "Jerusalem," wrote Agrippas, "is not only the metropolis of Judea alone, but of many lands of the entire diaspora, to indicate to you that those who dwell in the diaspora are Jews, members of the nation in the land of Israel who happen to live in foreign countries."¹

Of the diaspora communities, it was Alexandrian Jewry whose wealth, political power and intense Jewish loyalties placed it in the first rank. Modern historians have noted certain parallels between that Alexandrian Jewish community of the first century and the American Jewish community of the twentieth century—its communal organization around the synagogue, a high degree of cultural assimilation and intermarriage offset by the Jewish knowledge and loyalty of a significant minority, and, above all, the indissoluble links to the Jewish community in the land of Israel.² A combination of factors, not the least of which was the Hasmonean image of the Jew as fighting man, Jewish national pride and solidarity even after Judea became a Roman province, and the belief in the superiority of the Jewish religious tradition, enmeshed the Greco-Roman Jewish diaspora and the Jewish community in Palestine in a relationship which increasingly developed along the lines of a Greek tragedy.

The increasing reflection of those specific developments in the Jewish diaspora of the first and second centuries which, to a certain extent, are relevant to our own era, is best mirrored in the masterful reconstruction of that period by the late Jewish historian, Gedalyahu Alon.³

In the Greco-Roman diaspora, the Jews constituted a religio-ethnic minority contending with other minorities for political, economic and social status. This jockeying for position took place under a benign Roman rule notable for its liberal attitude, particularly toward the Jews. The Caesars and the Roman civil administration constantly intervened on behalf of the Jews to guarantee them untrammelled freedom to observe the Sabbath, the festivals and the dietary laws. Characteristic of Roman religious toleration is the directive of the Roman administrator, Publius Dolabella, addressed to the civil authorities and to the people of Ephesus in Asia Minor:

Alexander (an envoy of Hyrcanus II, the Hasmonean ruler of Judea) has explained to me that his co-religionists cannot undertake military service because they may not bear arms or march on the days of the Sab-

1. *Contra Flaccus* 7:46.

2. Harry Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947). Introduction and Chapter 1; Saul Lieberman, "Response to the Introduction by Professor Alexander Marx," *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, vol. XII (1948), reprinted in *The Jewish Expression*, edited with an introd. by Judah Goldin (New York: Bantam Books, 1970), pp. 119-133.

3. "Milhemet Ha-Yehudim Ba-tefuzot Biyemei Trinus," in *Toledot Ha-yehudim B'Erez Yisrael Bitekufat Ha-mishnah V'ha-talmud* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuhad, 1958), pp. 202-264.

bath; nor can they obtain the native foods to which they are accustomed. I, therefore, like the governors before me, grant them exemption from military service and allow them to follow their native customs and to come together for sacred and holy rites in accordance with their law, and to make offerings for their sacrifices (in Jerusalem).⁴

One would be hard pressed to find a parallel to this liberal position in modern times, even in the free countries of the West.

Despite this unusual degree of freedom and toleration—or more precisely because of it—the Jews of the Greco-Roman diaspora spared no effort in improving their political, social and economic position. They were opposed by the Greek population of the Roman provinces, an ethnic minority who looked upon the Jews as rivals in every respect. Between these two rival minorities, each suffused with intense national pride and ambition, stood the native populations (the Egyptians in Egypt, the Syrians in Syria, etc.) and the Roman administration. In Alexandria, the rivalry between Greeks and Jews reached the point of conflagration when the Jews were prevented from participating in the citizens' council which was to select a delegation to be sent to Rome. For both the Greek and the Jewish minorities, the act, though perhaps of little consequence in itself, dramatized the basic issue of Jewish political and social equality. In the hostilities which followed and in the bloody riots which erupted periodically over a period of approximately seventy-five years, from 38 to 115 C.E., not only in Alexandria but throughout the Greco-Roman diaspora, Alon has noted several critical factors in the Gentile-Jewish conflict.

1. The Caesars and the Roman provincial administrators generally took an impartial stand in the conflict between Jews and Greek. Although urged by the Greeks to deprive the Jews of their rights, the Caesars, in general, refused to do so. There were, of course, exceptions. In Alexandria, Flaccus, the Roman governor, with the connivance of the Greek population, forcibly installed graven images in the synagogues of the city. In addition, the Greeks drove the Jews from their dwellings in various parts of the city, sought to deny their rights of residence and committed unspeakable atrocities against the leaders of the Jewish community. Once Flaccus was removed by the authorities in Rome, the Jews, in the new spirit of the Hasmonean militants, wreaked their vengeance on the Greek population. The attitude of the Caesars and of the Roman administration toward the Jews (as well as toward the Greeks and other minorities) was determined by political self-interest. A Jewish community in Palestine and a large Jewish diaspora loyal to Rome and living in peace with its neighbors was worthy of political rights and religious toleration, but such an ethnic group which caused political disturbances in the empire had to be suppressed and punished.

4. Josephus, *Antiquities*, Book XIV, 10, 12.

2. In their conflict with the Greek communities in Egypt and in the other Roman provinces, the Jews were sometimes aided by the native populations and, at other times, found the indigenous inhabitants arrayed against them on the side of the Greeks. To the extent that the Greeks represented the upper strata of society and sought to suppress the rights of the Jews and the native population, the Jews and the native populations of Asia Minor found themselves allied. However, to the extent that the Jews differed sharply in religion and national and cultural ties from both Greeks and the native population, they found themselves, as so often in Jewish history, in the unenviable position of the middle man. The upper class Greeks made common cause with the lower class natives in their attacks on the Jews.

3. The messianic fervor of the Zealots and the Sicarii in Palestine who, according to Josephus, recognized no authority but God, alone, spilled over into the diaspora. During the Roman-Jewish War of 66-70 C.E., the Palestinian fighters came to Alexandria to enlist support against Rome and intruded themselves into the local conflict between Greeks and Jews. When the Roman administration sought to mediate the local conflict, the Palestinian Zealots inflamed the Alexandrian Jewish community against the Roman administration, precipitating a bloody riot in which many Jews lost their lives.

4. After the destruction of the Jewish State, in the year 70 C.E., Zealot and Sicarii refugees came to Alexandria and Cyrene, as well as to other cities in the Greco-Roman diaspora, and sought to incite the local Jewish community against the Gentile population and the Roman administration. The leaders of the Jewish community and the wealthy Jews, in particular, opposed these militant messianists and, in a number of instances, handed them over to the Roman administration. However, the masses of lower class Jews who were often the most exposed to Greek provocations and pogroms and in whom Jewish national loyalties were particularly strong, responded enthusiastically to the Palestinian militants. Thus, Josephus relates that one of the Sicarii, Jonathan the Weaver, came to Cyrene and persuaded many of the lower classes to follow him into the desert where he showed them magical signs and wonders. The dignitaries among the Jews denounced Jonathan to Catullus, the governor of the Libyan Pentapolis, who attacked the unarmed masses, killing and capturing many of them.⁵

In the end, Greek provocation and pogrom, Jewish national pride and solidarity, as well as the Hasmonean image of the fighting Jew, collided with Imperial Rome's determination to quell disorder in the empire. The result was the tragic uprising of diaspora Jewry in 115-117 C.E. and a smaller insurrection in Judea, known to historians as the Second War against Trajan. It occurred when the Roman Emperor Trajan

5. Josephus, *Wars*, Book VII, 1-4.

was involved in a primary war against the Parthians in the eastern reaches of the Empire. In Alexandria, the long simmering animosity between Greeks and Jews boiled over when the Greeks mocked the Jews publicly in a satirical play and then, emboldened by this propaganda, lured a group of unsuspecting Alexandrian Jews into a trap and slaughtered them. The Jews retaliated in strength against the Greek population throughout Egypt and on Cyprus and in Cyrene. Trajan dispatched one of his ablest generals to quell the Jewish uprising and to restore order. In the same year, when Trajan thought the Parthians subdued, the Jews of Mesopotamia, who suffered greatly during the four years of Trajan's campaign, rose in rebellion, along with other ethnic groups in the region, determined to expell the Romans from their country. Trajan's African general, Lusius Quietus, already aware of the Jewish uprising to the south in Egypt, fiercely purged the Jewish communities of Parthia. He was rewarded with the governorship of Palestine, only to confront a smaller rebellion in Judea by Jews seeking to assist their brethren in Egypt. Quietus ruthlessly crushed that rebellion as he had done the one in Mesopotamia. In these uprisings, the Jewish community of Alexandria was reduced to a shadow of its former self and other Jewish communities in the diaspora ceased to exist altogether.

5. The overall Roman policy of religious toleration and autonomy in the internal affairs of the Jewish community remained in force in those Jewish communities (such as the Jewish community of Rome) which did not participate in the uprisings. Even in Alexandria, itself, once the uprising had been put down, the Romans protected the remnants of the Jewish community from Greek retaliation and renewed, once again, their liberal policies with regard to the Jews.

II

Although the Holocaust and the birth of the third Jewish Commonwealth in the present State of Israel are *sui generis*, they have generated the same images of martyrdom and military prowess which so deeply stirred the Jews of antiquity and which are engraved on the stone memorials and the living memories of world Jewry today. Once again, of the two images, it is that of the fighting Jew which predominates. The slogan of the Jewish Defense League, "Never Again," has its more disciplined counterpart in Israel in the swearing-in ceremony of the paratroopers, which includes a mandatory visit to Yad V'Shem. In the secularized Jewish diaspora of our time, Israel (especially the Israel of military prowess) has, to a large extent, overshadowed God and Torah in the well known Zoharic triad as the focal point of Jewish commitment. There is a messianic aura associated with the State of Israel which affects even the most alienated Jews. In Israel, this messianic fervor is

often expressed by identifying Jewish tradition in all its forms with the interests of the State. In a symposium held recently in Jerusalem, in which the areas of tension between religion and state were explored, Chief Rabbi Shlomo Goren (who was then Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv) argued that we were living at the beginning of the messianic era in which the needs of the state—immigration and defense—were all that mattered. It is significant that this view is expressed by the leading member of the religious establishment in Israel who, as former Chief Chaplain of the Israel Defense Forces, identifies himself completely with the image of the fighting Jew. This messianic impulse, which unites world Jewry around the Jewish State, also means the involvement of diaspora Jewry around the Jewish State and vice versa. As in the Jewish diaspora of the Second Commonwealth era, so in the Jewish diaspora of the twentieth century, Jewish-Gentile relations have been profoundly affected by the magnetic field emanating from the State of Israel.

A brief glance at the Jewish diaspora in our day reveals the extent to which Israel, the reality as well as the emotion-laden image, has been injected into local issues of Jewish-Gentile relations in many countries. Aside from the Arab countries whose Jewish populations were directly affected by the Israeli-Arab wars, the clearest evidence of this influence is the impact of the Six Day War on Soviet Jewry. The Zionist renaissance, the Jewish activism and the demand for the right to emigrate to Israel have enormously altered the relationship of the Russian Jewish community, not only with the Soviet bureaucracy but, also, with the local populace.

Traces of the historic trends which acted upon the Jewish diaspora in the Second Commonwealth period are also evident in the Jewish communities of North America. As the strains and tensions of ethnic and racial rivalry increase in the United States, American Jewry will become more and more vulnerable as a result of its special relationship to Israel and to world Jewry. Already the ambivalence which characterized the relationship of Alexandrian Jews and the native population of Egypt on the one hand, and the antagonism of Greeks and Jews on the other hand, is manifest in the position of American Jewry vis-à-vis the Black minority and the white Gentile majority. The alliance between Blacks and Jews in combatting racial and religious prejudice in American society is now offset by an intense competition between the two minorities for economic and political power. It has become increasingly clear, particularly in New York City, that the non-Jewish white majority is not above sacrificing Jewish economic and political rights to appease Black demands. As the tensions between the Jewish and the Black minorities are exacerbated in the large metropolitan areas, it is the Jews of the lower classes who are exposed to Black violence and crime. As was the case in the Jewish diaspora in the first century, it is

these lower class Jews who are most susceptible to the new image of the militant Jew fighting for his rights as projected by the Jewish Defense League and other militant groups. In the American Jewish community, the image of the fighting Jew has also attracted many young people, some from assimilated backgrounds, some from traditional homes, as well as disenchanted Jewish leftists who have exchanged the extremes of the militant left for the extremes of the militant right.

The cleavage in the Jewish community between students and lower class Jews on the one hand, and the wealthy members of the Jewish establishment on the other, is strikingly akin to the split in the Jewish diaspora communities in antiquity. As the Jewish establishment of Alexandria in the first century did not hesitate to turn over Jewish militants to the Roman authorities, so has there been no hesitation in the American Jewish establishment to inform federal authorities concerning the activities of the Jewish militants of our day.

In other diaspora communities, as well, Jewish militancy could be evoked by anti-Jewish tensions in combination with the Israeli image of the fighting Jew. In Canada, there are anti-Semitic rumblings in the separatist movement in Quebec which have sent tremors of uneasiness through the Montreal Jewish community. In South America, the Jewish community is balanced precariously between the dictators of the right and the left, between the extremist movements in their strident anti-Israel and anti-Semitic propaganda. Even in Australia, a right wing party gaining in strength and popularity has made no secret of its anti-Israel and anti-Jewish bias. Finally, the emergence of a world-wide network of terrorist groups linked to the Arab terrorist organizations and committed to the destruction of Jewish life and property all over the world will only serve to increase the influence and the activities of Jewish militants. These developments will tax, to the utmost, the ingenuity of Jewish moderates attempting to steer the Jewish community between the extremes of right wing militancy and left wing pacifism.

It is fatuous to suggest that the State of Israel and the Jewish diaspora today are merely reenacting a scenario from the period of the Second Commonwealth. Nevertheless, George Santayana's well known view that he who ignores the lessons of the past is destined to relive them does have pertinence to the relationship of the two poles of Jewish existence in our time. For Jews, messianism has expressed itself primarily as direct action on the stage of history. With the historic reality of a Jewish State, the messianic ideal has often served as the halo for political achievement and military prowess. It has been the catalyst of Jewish revival, but has also lead Israel down the path of grief and destruction. As in the past, the new generations in Israel and the diaspora will have to walk the tightrope between Jewish militancy and Jewish survival.

Rosenzweig on Judaism and Christianity— The Two Covenant Theory

MAURICE G. BOWLER

Introduction

FRANZ ROSENZWEIG (1886–1929) BELONGS TO the twilight marking the end of the period in Germany Jewry's history which began with Moses Mendelssohn in the eighteenth century and ended in stark tragedy in the twenties. The problems of persecution, assimilation, and the challenge of the surrounding culture which are never far from Jews in exile, take on the shades and colours peculiar to Rosenzweig's period as we examine his life and work.

One special contribution which arises from the experiences, studies and special insights of this outstanding figure of Jewish thought is his "Two Covenant" theory of the relationship between God, Israel and the Church. Rosenzweig first broadly indicates the terms of God's dealings with the world, but then makes a qualification with regard to Israel. The covenant between God and the world is seen by Rosenzweig to operate through the mediation of Jesus of Nazareth. He says, "We are wholly agreed as to what Christ and his church mean to the world: no one can reach the Father save through him."¹ As these words were written after Rosenzweig had considered, and decided against, being baptized himself, this position of Rosenzweig and his fellow-Jews naturally requires clarification. He gives the clarification by saying, "But the situation is quite different for one who does not have to reach the Father because he is already with him. And this is true of the people of Israel (although not of individual Jews)."²

Thus, God's covenant with Israel is seen to be of a different nature from that with the rest of the world. Whereas one is a "Way," involving movement into a covenant relationship with the Father, the other is a "Life," which is, itself, a relationship with God and, in Rosenzweig's view, exempts the Jew from any recourse to the mediation of Jesus. The full implications of these two covenants are brought out as Rosenzweig describes, in his other writings, the two communities which the respective covenants produce.

1. Quoted by Nahum Glatzer, *Franz Rosenzweig: His Life and Thought* (New York: Schocken Books, 1961), p. 341.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 341.

MAURICE G. BOWLER is a divinity graduate of London University, England, and recently completed a Master's course in Judaic Studies at Sir George Williams University, Montreal.

An Evaluation

PRACTICAL

In both the positive and the negative reactions to Rosenzweig's Two Covenant theory, there have been indications that an ecumenical significance has been attributed to Rosenzweig's scheme. Borchsenius saw in it "the breakthrough to real dialogue,"³ while Schoeps says that Rosenzweig's recognition of the Church's world mission is the key to future Judeo-Christian discussion (and), "without this Jewish admission in the future no further discussion is possible."⁴ On the other hand, Taubes accuses Rosenzweig of arranging "a rapprochement between Christians and Jews somewhat too neatly,"⁵ while Neher refers to that rapprochement as "*unissant intimement, et d'une manière à la fois agressive et indéchirable, le judaïsme au christianisme.*"⁶ But the rapprochement which the critics have feared and which the supporters have eagerly anticipated has not materialized.

One reason could be that the ecumenical movement tends to operate on the institutional level, in the realm of ecclesiastical statesmanship, a sphere which had no attraction and very little significance for Rosenzweig. He was not concerned to strive for any practical liaison between Jewish and Christian organizations.

It was different, however, on the personal level, where Rosenzweig could speak of "communion." Of his fellowship with Rosenstock he says, "... where Eugen and I met, no antiquated walls separate man and man . . . Our communion—which I tried to resist between 1913 and 1917—is safe. Judaism, Christianity, Creation: what has happened to us with regard to all three is the living faith . . ."⁷

Another reason which would have the effect of inhibiting ecumenical initiative from the Jewish side is the almost unanimous suspicion, which may be noted from Jewish writers, that Rosenzweig's high estimate of the Church involves a corresponding lowering of the position of the Synagogue.

HISTORICAL

Another significant aspect of Rosenzweig's scheme is the interpretation of history which it involves. Rosenzweig was aware that he was living through cataclysmic events, especially as he saw World War I come to a

3. Poul Borchsenius, *Two Ways to God* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1968). p. 191.

4. Hans J. Schoeps, *The Jewish-Christian Argument* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), pp. 141-142.

5. Jacob Taubes, *Arguments and Doctrines*, ed. A. Cohen (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1970), p. 411.

6. André Neher, *L'existence juive* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1962), p. 228.

7. Franz Rosenzweig, *Judaism Despite Christianity*, ed. E. Rosenstock (New York:

disastrous conclusion for his native Germany. But living so near the events, he could not be expected to understand just how deep an abyss was opening up in world history. His whole sacral view of history, which stems from his positive interpretation of the Constantinian revolution in the church, caused him to hold on to ideas which were already anachronistic. He writes, "Christianity has been able to synthesize with the world. What matters is the fruitful tension of such syntheses, which has given Christian Europe her spiritual dominance in the world."⁸

Here Rosenzweig is still thinking in terms of "Christendom." In the same context, he could write about "secularization," and he even seems to anticipate modern ideas about "religionless Christianity" as he looks into the future. But he is still basically oriented to a Constantinian view of history and still sees the Church as dominant, triumphant and mistress in the world. But, despite the fall of the Hohenzollerns and the Romanovs, the decline of the British Empire and the decreasing relevance of religious influence in national and international politics, Rosenzweig could not see that "establishment" was not of the essence of the Church, even though it was a phase of many centuries' duration. But the Church did not begin as an established and privileged Imperial cult, and even in Rosenzweig's day it had ceased to have this status in Russia and in most of Europe. It had certainly never been thus privileged in North America (whose rising eminence as a world power and effective dominance of world affairs even in his day seems to have escaped Rosenzweig's notice). It is not surprising, then, that in the intellectual climate of the '50s after World War II, when Rosenzweig's thought began to make its impact, this historical factor in his work should raise problems.

THEOLOGICAL

But, for most interpreters, the general focus of attention on Rosenzweig's Two Covenant theory seems to be on the positive evangelizing role of the Church in the world. It is his "taking of Christianity's claim more seriously"⁹ that encourages Borchsenius, and it is his inclination to "all but concede the force of the Christian argument"¹⁰ which incenses Arthur Cohen. It is the idea that a modern Jew should "pray for the conversion of the whole non-Jewish world to Christianity"¹¹ that causes Emil Fackenheim to reject the Two Covenant theory with such vehemence. But this is not at all Rosenzweig's point of emphasis regarding the Church. Despite anything that his critics or supporters might say, Rosenzweig's scheme is not Church-oriented but Israel-oriented. The

Schocken Books, 1971), pp. 75-76.

8. Glatzer, p. 274.

9. Borchsenius, p. 191.

10. Taubes, p. 402.

11. *Commentary Magazine*, August, 1968.

Church is brought into the picture in order to relate it to a centrally-placed Israel and not vice-versa, as Arthur Cohen suggests when he accuses Rosenzweig of seeing the Jews as "compelled by history to function alongside Christianity, neither true nor false, but historically relativized."¹²

Rosenzweig's emphasis on the role of the Church, which Cohen and others criticize, has to be seen, in fairness to the critics, as a contrast to his treatment of Judaism, which is not handled in the theological and philosophical way he deals with Christianity. As Julius Guttmann points out, *The Star* "is not a philosophy of Judaism. It does not intend—at least in the important sections of the book—to evaluate Judaism."¹³ Certainly, Rosenzweig goes into great and loving detail about the lore, customs and worship of the Jewish people, but he sees them in a different light from the Church, which he sees as a community of "the spirit."¹⁴ But of the Jewish people he says, "This people has a unique characteristic which, when one tries to dismiss it through the front door of reason, forces an entrance through the back door of feeling."¹⁵ Following this line, Rosenzweig does not pit Jewish theology against Christian theology. That would be out of keeping with his whole approach. His whole aim is to contrast Christianity, seen as a theoretical system, with Jewish *life*. He presents Christianity as a way, a system, a philosophy which, he admits, is the best kind in the world. Judaism, however, is not of this "kind" at all. A Jew is not *won* into Israel; he is *born* into it. He does not confess, "I believe." Instead, he declares, silently if necessary, "*I am*, and I prove what I am by what I *do*." Writers such as Cohen seem to prefer to fight their battle on the Christian ground of theology. Rosenzweig, however, is not alone in Jewish thought in choosing to take up his stand on Jewish practice and tradition as being the essence of Judaism. Credit, therefore, can be given to the Church for its "Way" without detriment to Judaism's "Life."

Conclusion

As we noticed at the beginning of this study, Rosenzweig stands at the end of a period that began with Moses Mendelssohn facing the challenge of the Enlightenment, but which ended in the bitter smoke of the gas chambers. Rosenzweig's approach has been characterized as unique by Glazer,¹⁶ Borchsenius,¹⁷ Scholem,¹⁸ and others; and, if his passion for

12. Taubes, p. 402.

13. Julius Guttmann, *Philosophy of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1964), p. 372.

14. Franz Rosenzweig, *The Star of Redemption* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971), p. 299.

15. Glatzer, p. 335.

16. *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

17. Borchsenius, p. 191.

18. G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 322.

Jewish survival is accepted as his basic drive, it could be traced to the unique challenge of his day. A previous threat to Jewish existence had been directed by the monolithic Church-State synthesis of the Middle Ages against intellectual dissent. A centripetal society, it sought to draw each and every kind of man into its vortex and reserved its venom for Waldenses, Albigenses, Marranos and Jews who refused to assimilate. Like Moloch of old it was especially partial to children.

But in Rosenzweig's day, a centrifugal society was forming in Germany, which sought to spin off every foreign and exotic element. Taught by Gobineau, H. S. Chamberlain and Nietzsche and later by Hitler, the new totalitarianism had a morbid fear of children, and saw some magical powers in the blood of gypsies and Jews and other non-Aryans which could permeate and eventually overwhelm the racially pure *Herrenvolk*. No longer was assimilation demanded—it was feared as a cloak for a pernicious infiltration of the native stock.

Rosenzweig could not have known Hitler, but he was familiar with the works of Gobineau,¹⁹ Chamberlain,²⁰ and, of course, Nietzsche.²¹ Knowing the "folk" orientation of this school of thought, he would be able to foresee the kind of tensions that would arise between German society and its Jewish minority, but, of course, he could not have known what depths this "folk"-mania would plumb. For him, and for the community he was seeking to serve, the future had to be worked out in the context of German society, for better or for worse. His rallying cry, "Into Life"²² did not have a transfer to Palestine or North America as a pre-condition. "Life" meant holding onto, and maintaining, the continuity of a Jewish life in Germany which had survived the challenge and tragedies of the centuries.

Seen in this light, the Two Covenant theory can be understood as a *modus vivendi* to enable Jewish life to go on, even in a hostile milieu. From this angle, the exclusion of Jews from the Church's evangelistic mandate was not a prohibition, but a release from an obligation on the part of the Gentile church authorities. Whereas, under a universal mandate, Jews would have to be encouraged to join the fellowship of Gentile Christians and welcomed as brothers and sisters in Christ when they did join, they could now be bypassed with a clear conscience.

Also, Rosenzweig's strong emphasis on the racial element in Judaism, in which he put such stress on "blood," could be the exact opposite of the claim to superiority it might at first seem. It could be seen as a guarantee of Jewish apartness, an undertaking that Jews would hold them-

19. *Judaism Despite Christianity*, p. 107.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 117.

22. *The Star*, p. 424.

selves aloof from the sacred genetic bank which the racists were so jealously guarding.

All this is not to deny the wide sweep and relevance of Rosenzweig's universal concepts, nor does it detract from the philosophical value of the New Thinking and its place in the development of Western thought. But Rosenzweig's experience and the letters which distill his reflections on this experience show clearly that his ideas were not formed in a vacuum, and that they had an unmistakable connection with the hard facts of his situation.

If, then, Rosenzweig did seek to chart a course for German Jewry in the troubled years between the wars, his desire was frustrated. Because of the national insanity which seized the German people, no thoughtful or reasonable counsel could hope to prevail. But where reason could not operate, armed might did, and the "thousand year Reich" was swept away and many of the factors that seemed so permanent in German life were swept away with it. But the German Jewish community was already destroyed. The situation to which Rosenzweig addressed himself, therefore, no longer exists. His European diaspora orientation and his Constantinian view of history are now anachronistic. The tolerance for which he argued cogently on behalf of Judaism is available now in the West to all religions on the grounds of indifferentism and not of mutual respect, and it is denied in the East on the same grounds.

It is a fact of history that neither Rosenzweig nor anybody else really solved German Jewry's problems, and it yet remains to be seen if Rosenzweig's philosophy will help American Jewry in the problems it faces today. But in the matter of the Two Covenant theory the very formulation of the concept may serve a useful purpose. In the world of science, it is not only successful experiments and confirmed hypotheses which are recorded in the scientific journals. It is of considerable academic importance if a reasonable-sounding hypothesis, carefully investigated by the use of the appropriate experiments and controls, is shown to be invalid. Such a report can save time for succeeding experimenters.

In the field of Jewish-Christian dialogue, Rosenzweig has gone farther than any other, according to his interpreters, in the direction of reconciliation between Church and Synagogue. Because of his remarkable background, his learning and lack of learning, his experience and lack of experience, Rosenzweig was ideally equipped for the experiment he made. People with less learning would have been unable to draw on the many sources which he used from world literature. People with a stricter and more systematic training in Jewish sources would not have attempted what he did. A person who had never hovered on the brink of conversion to Christianity would never be able to show the sympathy and insight towards it which he does. And a person who has not fought back to a position of commitment to an ancestral faith would lack the compassion

for the weak and wavering which Rosenzweig showed to the "periphery" Jews who came to the *Lehrhaus* in Frankfurt. But with all his efforts, the situation remains as it was; the problem of Jewish and Christian antipathy remains unresolved. But if a problem is to be solved, it is all gain to know that the problem still waits solution.

When the facts of the respective Jewish and Christian positions are examined, especially when the Christian claims for Christ and the Jewish denials of those claims are considered, it seems that the available options are clear. Both Judaism and Christianity could be wrong. Judaism could be right and Christianity could be wrong. Or, Christianity could be right and Judaism wrong. What is not possible is that Christianity and Judaism, as we know them, could both be right in the absolute sense of the word "right." There is, of course, much common ground on which both Jews and Christians agree. Also, where subjective statements about personal convictions are made, such as "I believe in the Trinity," or "I do not believe in the Trinity," both statements can be accepted as true because both are affirmations about a state of mind on which the speakers are, presumably, the best authorities. But if I say, "God is a Trinity," I am not making a statement about my convictions but I am making a statement about God. Such a statement can be verified only by reference to the nature of God. If it is decided that God is, indeed, a Trinity, then the antithetical statement, "God is not a Trinity," must be held to be untrue. Both Judaism and Christianity purport to deal with the truth about God, and unless this truth has a genuine objective relevance to God and not merely to the subjective opinions of the believer, it has very little value. Because Jew and Christian reach diametrically opposed positions on the depravity of man and the unity of God and many other issues, we have to accept Arthur Cohen's verdict that, "Christian and Jew are locked in theological enmity."²³ But because God is one, we can look forward hopefully to the time when He will unite into one people those who look to Him. For this reason we can hope that the controversy between Jew and Christian will prove to be a *mahloket leshelem shamayim* (a struggle in the name, and for the sake, of Heaven).

23. A. Cohen, *The Myth of the Judeo-Christian Tradition* (New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 209.

The Mystery of the Rabbi's Lost Portrait

ARTHUR A. CHIEL

IN SEPTEMBER OF 1783, EZRA STILES, THE SEVENTH president of Yale College, whose diary is a rich mine of information about persons and events of his day, reported:

We have now Portraits in oyl colours in the Library, King George I, Gov. Saltonstall, Rev. John Davenport first minister of New Haven, Rev. Mr. Pierpont one of the Founders of this College, Rev. Prof. Strong, Rabbi Carigal, besides Mezzotints of Gov. Yale and Bishop Berkeley.

Each of the portraits mentioned by Stiles had significance for Yale. George I represented the relationship of the earlier New Haven colony to Britain. John Davenport was a founding father of the colony. The others were directly linked with Yale's fortunes in their roles as patrons and, in the instance of Strong, as an erstwhile member of the faculty. But Rabbi Carigal fits into none of these associations and the question arises as to why, indeed, his portrait was part of the Yale Library. An even more puzzling question concerns the disappearance of the Carigal painting from that collection which President Stiles so carefully inventoried in his diary. The answer to the first question dates back to his experiences and relationships in Newport, Rhode Island, before he became president of Yale. The answer to the second is connected with circumstances that followed Stiles' death in New Haven, in 1795.

Newport, before the Revolutionary War, was a flourishing and cosmopolitan city, a major seaport which sent large numbers of vessels out to sea. These ships sailed everywhere—to England, Africa, the West Indies and every port along the American coast. Newport was part of the larger Aquidneck Island, with green rolling fields and handsome orchards. On Aquidneck were to be found the grand estates of the sea-merchants who had made their fortunes in the very extensive import-export trade. Among its colonial tycoons were men like Abraham Redwood, who generously endowed Newport's excellent Redwood Library, and Aaron Lopez, who readily contributed towards the upbuilding of Rhode Island College, later to be known as Brown University. Newport had been originally settled by religious nonconformists and, somehow, that right to be different continued, permitting for Congregationalists, Anglicans, Quakers and Jews to live together in an amicable manner.

Reverend Ezra Stiles, the learned minister of the Second Congregationalist Church from 1755, fully appreciated Newport for all of its civ-

ARTHUR A. CHIEL is Rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jacob, Woodbridge, Conn., and associate fellow of Ezra Stiles College, Yale University.

ilized advantages. It was a city that stood in strong contrast to his native town, New Haven, which had remained conservative and dour in its religious and cultural outlook. In particular did Stiles appreciate the opportunities to meet and to "hold converse" with men of erudition and experience who came and went in the years before the outbreak of the war. Among the visitors whom Stiles troubled to meet were several rabbis who stayed for varying periods as guests of the then thriving Jewish community. But of the rabbis whom he came to know, the one among them who intrigued him was Rabbi Raphael Haim Isaac Carigal, who spent five months, from March through July of 1773, as the honored guest of the Newport Jewish Congregation.

The "Hebrew Rabbi from Macpelah in the Holy Land" as Stiles first described him in a diary entry, proved to be, to Stiles' satisfaction, a man of learning and sensibility. Very soon after Carigal's arrival, Stiles made it a point to attend a service at the Newport synagogue, as he had often done before. It was the Purim eve service at which the Scroll of Esther was read. As Rabbi Carigal stood on the *bimah*, Stiles, seated in a pew below, took his first impressions of the man. He judged the rabbi to be about forty-five. "He was dressed in a red garment," Stiles noted in his diary that night. "He wore a high brown furr cap, and had a long beard. He has the appearance of an ingenious and sensible Man."¹

Three weeks passed before their first personal encounter. In late March, Rabbi Carigal, accompanied by Stiles' long-time friend, Aaron Lopez, came to Stiles' residence. It was a case of *amor intellectualis* at first sight. In his diary-entry for that fateful day, March 30th, Stiles reported:

The Rabbi is aet. 39, a large Man, neat and well dressed in the Turkish Habit. We conversed largely on the Gemara, the 2 Talmuds (of which he preferred the Babylonish) the Changes of the Hebrew Language in different Ages. He was born in Hebron, where he says are only 107 Families of Jews. From aet. 7, has followed his Studies. He says, one may breakfast at Hebron and dine at Jerusalem, which are but six hours apart. He has been at Samaria, Tiberias, and thro' the Holy Land, at Constantinople etc. etc. He spake of Aly Bey, and shewed me a passage in the Zohar which he said predicted that the Russian should conquer the Turks. I observed that in the Original it was that Edom should conquer the Ismaelites—he replied that Edom there denoted a Northern Power, and the Ismaelites those of their Religion. He said he did not understand Arabic to read it, upon my showing him an Arabic Extract from Euty-

1. Stiles must have erred in this diary-entry of March 8, 1773, when he indicated that Rabbi Carigal also wore "the usual phylacteries" at the Purim evening service. Jewish sources do offer instances where rabbinic eminences would wear *tallit*-and-*tefillin* throughout the day-light hours. In the Talmud (Menahot 36a-36b) we are informed that "R. Hisda and Rabbah b. R. Huna used to say the evening prayers while still wearing them," but the *halakhah* "agrees with R. Jacob" who says that *tefillin* are not to be worn after sunset. The "red garment" to which Stiles refers was a gown in Turkish style, of which a full description is to be found in Alfred Rubens, *A History of Jewish Costume* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1967), p. 90.

chius. Yet he said it was the common Tongue now in the Holy Land, only the Jews were not allowed to learn the Writing. I shewed him the first Psalm in Arabic but in Hebrew Letters—he read it off freely—and I suppose that I then for the first Time heard the true pronunciation of Arabic. But he did not perfectly understand it. He said the vernacular Arabic now was different from the antient. . . . Evening coming on he took Leave in a polite and friendly manner.

This first session, which had run for several hours, was the start of an auspicious series of encounters which, in the following several months, grew into a remarkable friendship.

Stiles learned that Carigal was born in 1733, that he was educated, and that he was ordained as rabbi at the precocious age of seventeen. In 1754, Carigal had set out on a series of voyages, remaining for periods of time in each of the places which he visited. He traversed all of the Middle East, visiting Egypt, Turkey, Syria and Greece. He then moved on to Europe, visiting Italy, Germany, Holland and England. In 1761, when he was twenty-eight, he arrived in Curaçao to fill in for the local rabbi who had returned to Holland for further studies. In 1764, Carigal went back to Holland, eventually making his way homeward to Palestine. Four years later, in 1768, he sailed for France and then to England where he taught Talmud at a London *yeshivah* for over two years. Then, in 1772, Carigal arrived in the American colonies, spending time in New York and Philadelphia before coming to Newport.

A major event during Rabbi Carigal's stay was the *Shavuot* service in the Newport synagogue. For the first of the two-day services, on May 28, 1773, the congregation invited city and colony officials to attend worship so that they might hear Rabbi Carigal. Stiles took careful notes of the content and manner of the preaching. The sermon, he reported, ran some forty-seven minutes and was delivered in Spanish, interspersed with Hebrew references. Stiles observed that Carigal's "Oratory, Elocution and Gestures were fine and oriental. It was very animated. . . ." Rabbi Carigal graciously reciprocated Reverend Stiles' attendance at the *Shavuot* service by a visit to Stiles' church on Sunday, June 27th, coming in the company of two Newport Jews. Stiles honored them by seating the visitors in his own family pew, and proceeded to preach a sermon which ran one and one quarter hours, a rather generous return for Carigal's forty-seven minutes preaching on *Shavuot*. Immediately following the service, Rabbi Carigal accompanied Stiles to his home, where Carigal informed his host that though he had visited various churches during his travels, "he had never heard a Christian preach a Sermon before." Stiles was obviously flattered. In the weeks that followed, the two men exchanged visits often, during which they debated in considerable detail the meaning of sundry Biblical texts: Were the verses to be taken literally or allegorically? What were the correct Messianic interpretations? What of

the divergencies between Judaic and Christian theological points? Wrote Stiles in his diary on April 6th, "We conversed much and freely."

And as if these dialogues were not completely adequate to their joint explorations, Stiles initiated an exchange of Hebrew correspondence between them. The subjects discussed in these epistles were an extension of their personal dialogues. For Stiles, the encounters of that spring and summer of 1773 were extraordinarily fruitful, unforgettable. In turn, for Carigal, they were a wholly unique experience, the opportunity to gain an insight into the thinking of an unusual Christian, an erudite in matters Hebraic, or to use Stiles' own term—an *Hebrician*. Stiles, the ardent diary-keeper, confessed that he "parted with him with great reluctance and should ever retain an affection for him." But in that same entry of July 19, 1773, Stiles went on to express his doubt that they would ever meet again or "see each other in the land of the living." He offered the prayer that perhaps the privilege of reunion would be theirs "in the Garden of Eden" in the joyous company of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Alas, Stiles was proven right in his premonition, for they never did see each other again face-to-face. They did, however, carry on an extensive correspondence, in Hebrew, in which matters of scholarship and sentiments of friendship were freely intermingled. Until 1777, letters running into many pages were exchanged between Newport and Barbados. In May of that year, Carigal, who had been serving as rabbi of the Jewish community in Bridgetown, took ill and died at the age of forty-four. In the meanwhile, too, the Revolutionary War had broken out and the Stiles family were forced to leave their beloved Newport. The town had become a strategic target for the British navy, and its people were caught up hard, in the middle of the war for independence. Stiles and his family made their way north and took refuge in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, where he served as a minister for one year. Then, in 1778, he was invited to the presidency of his alma mater, Yale College. Stiles accepted, though not without misgiving. The war had brought on a plenitude of problems for the small school, but with his characteristic efficiency and equanimity he managed to steer its affairs steadily in that critical time.

By 1781, Yale was back on a nearly balanced course and, for the first time since he had taken the presidency, Stiles could hold a public commencement for his academic institution. In that period, too, he turned particular attention to a project which he had mulled over for some time past. It related to his lamented friend, the Hebron rabbi who lay at rest in a Barbados cemetery. That Stiles was thinking of him is evidenced by his specific reference to Carigal in that first commencement address at Yale, which he delivered in Hebrew. In that presentation he spoke of Carigal as being "like Joseph of a comely aspect and beautiful countenance." As it soon became obvious, he apparently wanted for that

countenance to look down on his youthful students in the library at Yale. No doubt, too, he was eager for the opportunity to look up at the Palestinian rabbi, to remember a rare friendship shared. With this in mind, Stiles proceeded, with his not uncharacteristic diligence, to secure a portrait of Rabbi Carigal, for permanent exhibit at Yale.

Remembering that someone had done a miniature crayon sketch of Carigal, during his 1773 stay in Newport, Stiles entered into correspondence with his old friend of Newport days, Aaron Lopez. Lopez, the renowned sea-merchant and philanthropist, (who, in his youth, after fleeing Portugal, had shed his Marrano status for a complete return to Judaism) had also fled from Newport during the war and was then resident in Leicester, Massachussets. In May of 1781, on the occasion of Rabbi Carigal's fourth *yahrzeit* anniversary, Stiles wrote a letter to Lopez in which he proposed that a portrait be done from the crayon "picture" and that for this worthy purpose there be commissioned the artist, Samuel King, formerly of Newport and then of Boston. Stiles was quite specific that the portrait was to be done "in oyl colours which will be durable." He was extremely hopeful that Aaron Lopez would accept "the honour of purchasing and presenting it as a Donation to us." The portrait, Stiles indicated, would be "a perpetual Memorial of that illustrious Hebrew." Finally, Stiles expressed the sentiment that the portrait, which would be prominently exhibited in the Yale Library, "would be honourable to your Nation as well as ornamental to this University."

Two months passed before Stiles received a reply. Lopez had been away from Leicester, involved with his extensive business interests, so that it was mid-August, 1781, before he was back home at last and caught up with his accumulated correspondence. In his letter to Stiles, he apologized for the belated response. But he was so enthusiastic over the proposal that he had already made contact with Mr. Blodget in Providence, "the possessor of our Deceas'd Friend the Venerable Rabbi's Portrait, to favour me with the Loan of it..." Moreover, Blodget had graciously consented to make the loan and Lopez had dispatched the crayon likeness to the portraitist in Boston. Lopez further expressed his confidence in the talents of Samuel King, who had assured Lopez that he would exert his utmost to create a worthy painting. He went on to inform Stiles that as soon as King had completed the assignment, he, Lopez, would see to it that the finished portrait was "safely conveyed" to Yale College. A final detail in the letter to Stiles: that Lopez' father-in-law, Jacob Rodriguez Rivera, who, from Newport days, also held the Yale President in esteem, insisted on sharing with Lopez one-half the costs of the artist's fee. This, said Lopez, was Rivera's small expression of the warm regard he had for both Stiles and Carigal.

Aaron Lopez did not live to see this ecumenical effort to completion. In the interim, on May 28, 1782, he suffered a fatal accident while on

a journey from Leicester to Providence. Stiles mourned Lopez' untimely death at fifty-one, and paid his personal tribute in a diary entry of June 8, 1782, the sad news having reached him down in New Haven in a matter of days. Wrote Stiles:

. . . He was a Merchant of the first Eminence; for Honour and Extent of Commerce probably surpassed by no Merchant in America . . . His Beneficence to his Family Connexions, to his Nation, and to all the World is almost without a Parallel. He was my intimate Friend and Acquaintance! . . .

But the Carigal portrait project remained firm. Jacob Rivera, Lopez' sorrowing father-in-law, was determined to see it through to early completion. Stiles, if he suffered momentary anxiety, had that feeling quickly allayed and Samuel King, too, was assured that he must proceed with the assignment. The fact of the matter is that King was able to complete the portrait by August, 1782. It was in New Haven by early September.

Stiles was overjoyed at the portrait's arrival and he immediately penned a letter to Rivera, in Leicester, in which he expressed his unbounded appreciation for the gift. He paid particular tribute to the memory of Aaron Lopez. The portrait now represented to him solace for the loss of two rare friends—Carigal and Lopez. Understandably, Rivera and all of the Lopez family were appreciative of Stiles' expression of condolence and sympathy. In a letter of December 20, 1782, Rivera wrote to Stiles of his own pleasure and that of his late son-in-law in "the satisfaction of contributing" the portrait to Yale, that the opportunity of giving "infinitely surpasses the value of so small a gift." Rivera hastened to ask of Stiles that he let him know the cost of the frame, for which expense Rivera would reimburse him at the earliest opportunity.

Thus was realized the very fond dream of Ezra Stiles, to have his rabbi friend ensconced at Yale, even if in portrait. And the "Holy Land Rabbi" who had wandered from land to land and from continent to continent through the larger part of his life-time, now smiled down benignly from his honored position in the Yale library. According to the Stiles diary notation of September 19, 1783, Carigal was on exhibit in the goodly company of such eminences as King George I, Governor Saltonstall, Reverend John Davenport, Governor Yale and Bishop Berkeley. It can be very dependably assumed that the portrait remained hanging at Yale for the next twelve years, until the death of President Stiles in 1795. Stiles was clearly that kind of man, one of unwavering integrity. If his promise was, as, according to all the written evidence available, it certainly was, that Carigal's portrait was to be part of Yale's permanent collection, then it was so! Yet, in spite of Stiles' constancy, there developed, after 1795, something of a puzzlement surrounding the painting. For at some time after Stiles' death, the Carigal portrait disappeared from Yale. The fact of its disappearance was, however, not

noted, at least as a matter of written record, until some time in the early 1900's, more than a century later.

In 1901, Stile's voluminous diary, edited by Franklin Bowditch Dexter, was first published. On examining that work, Dr. Alexander A. Kohut, a rabbi-scholar, came across a number of references to the Carigal portrait. He pursued these clues with a visit to Yale and, upon inquiry, discovered that the painting had somehow passed into the possession of the Reverend J. L. Jenkins of Jamaica Plains, Massachusetts, a great-grandson of Ezra Stiles. Rabbi Kohut, who lived in New York, wrote to Reverend Jenkins about his curiosity and asked him a number of questions relevant to the portrait. Jenkins wrote back a brief description, qualified by his apology that "I fear I shall not succeed in describing it." He indicated that the portrait "has been greatly admired and much curiosity has been felt as to who painted it and where." Obviously, Jenkins had never examined Stiles' diary. But what meagre intelligence Reverend Jenkins did have on the matter, he shared with Kohut. He wrote: "On the painting is the following inscription . . . *Raphael Haijm Isaac Hargal* (sic!) *Born at Hebron educated there and at Jerusalem, MDCCCLXXII.*" Jenkins confessed that he knew little more about "the painting itself." But, in passing, Jenkins offered some crucial information: that in his childhood he saw the portrait hanging "in the home of my grandmother, Reverend Stiles' daughter Emilia . . ." Except, then, for the one further act of having the portrait photographed, Dr. Kohut let the Carigal matter rest, pursuing it no further. More than three decades passed before the portrait was again remembered.

In the late 1930's, Lee M. Friedman, a prominent Boston attorney and a dedicated researcher in American Jewish history, picked up where Dr. Kohut had left off, and was able to fill in additional details of the portrait's peregrinations. He ascertained that it had been inherited from Emilia Stiles Leavitt by her daughter, Mary Leavitt. Mary passed it on to her nephew, MacGregor Jenkins of Dover, Massachusetts, who, in turn, gave it over to his brother, Austin T. Jenkins of Chicago. Friedman makes no mention of Kohut's contact, Rev. J. L. Jenkins of Jamaica Plains, Massachusetts. Whoever Friedman's informant was, he somehow forgot to mention the Jamaica Plains descendant.

The question still remained: why and how did the Carigal portrait by Samuel King come into the possession of the Stiles family instead of remaining in its rightful place at Yale? It is our opinion that the answer surfaces at last in an informative foot-note which appears in the definitive biography of Ezra Stiles by Professor Edmund S. Morgan of Yale University (*The Gentle Puritan, A Life of Ezra Stiles*, Yale University Press, 1962). Professor Morgan offers a detailed inventory of the Stiles papers which are extant, and points out that Ezra Stiles had willed the larger part of his extensive personal collection of letters, manuscripts

and diaries to Yale, with the understanding that these would be properly filed and housed for posterity. Stiles had also specified that the collection was to be kept in the president's residence. Unfortunately, Stiles' successor at Yale, President Timothy Dwight, failed to honor these instructions. Dwight had been on the Yale faculty during Stiles' presidential incumbency and the two men had not gotten along well. In all likelihood, it was this unhappy relationship between them during their earlier years that subsequently reflected itself in the neglect of the Stiles collection by Dwight. Certainly Stiles' daughter interpreted it that way. On a visit, after her father's death, to ascertain the condition of the Stiles papers, Emilia Stiles Leavitt found them to be in a state of shocking disarray in a storage-shed on the Yale grounds. She was legitimately outraged by what she discovered and, in her anger, she may well have taken with her whatever she could carry away. Most particularly would she have taken the portrait of Carigal. She remembered very well the warm sentiments which her father had felt for the Hebron rabbi. At her visit she likely found that the Carigal portrait was being treated with the same disregard as the papers, gathering dust and dampness. It is wholly reasonable to assume that the daughter of Ezra Stiles, who "felt a fierce pride in her father," took the painting with her to her home in Greenfield, Massachusetts, where her father's beloved friend was given a decent spot on the wall in the family living-room. From there, of course, Carigal eventually moved on to sundry settings among the descending generations of the Stiles family.

The year 1977 will mark the two-hundredth *yahrzeit* of Rabbi Carigal's death. It would be a just and fitting tribute to his memory, to have the portrait restored to its Yale setting where it rightfully belongs. Ezra Stiles, whose own portrait, by Samuel King, hangs at Yale, would be the happier for it in the Garden of Eden, where he had expectation for an eternal reunion with his rabbi-friend. Aaron Lopez would be very pleased, too, as would, no doubt, his father-in-law, Jacob Rodriguez Rivera. As Stiles had put it—the portrait would do honor to the Hebrew nation and be ornamental to Yale College.

The Conservative Rabbinate— In Quest of Professionalism

VIVIANA A. ZELIZER

GERALD L. ZELIZER

A RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE 1970 CONVENTION of The Rabbinical Assembly formalized what had been, for several years, a latent feeling among Conservative rabbis:

Be it resolved that the president of the Rabbinical Assembly be re-directed to establish a commission to execute a thorough restructuring of our self-defined function as an assembly, devising procedures whereby the Rabbinical Assembly shall become a strong agent to negotiate with a congregation on behalf of its member rabbis.

Such words obviously reflect a feeling among Conservative rabbis that what they conceive of as professional status is not yet theirs. Similar cries have been heard from the rabbinate of the Orthodox and Reform movements. It is crucial to identify the feelings and frustrations which were the basis for this formal expression, but more important is an understanding of exactly what is meant by "professional," as well as a diagnosis to find which aspects of professionalism are already the rabbi's, and which aspects still delude him. Above all, is the expressed desire of the Conservative rabbi to attain professional status a reasonable goal or a pipedream?

The very emergence of rabbis who seek professional status is a step beyond other typologies which have in the past been ascribed to them. The first attempt to delineate categories of rabbis divided the Orthodox into traditional, free-lance and modern, but confessed that, among Conservative rabbis, "role differentiation was not extensive enough to warrant more than a single category."¹

It was Arthur Hertzberg who first established categories of Conservative rabbis. One group were either themselves foreign born or first-generation, lower-middle-class Americans, and their immediate spiritual and cultural roots were implanted in East European Jewry.² The main function of these rabbis was, in Marshall Sklare's terms, to "stem the tide of indifference," and to that end they developed a battery of "protestantized" functions such as preaching, teaching, pastoral duties, and relationship with the non-Jewish community. On the other hand, Hertz-

1. Jerome E. Carlin and Saul H. Mendlovitz, "The American Rabbi: A Religion Specialist Responds to Loss of Authority," in Marshall Sklare, *The Jews* (Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), p. 382.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 331.

VIVIANA A. ZELIZER is a Ph.D. candidate in Sociology at Columbia University.
GERALD L. ZELIZER is Rabbi of Temple Neve Shalom, Metuchen, N.J.

berg identified a second group of Conservative rabbis who were American born, as were at least one of their parents, and who came from a Conservative family of much higher socio-economic status than did the older category.

As far back as 1960, Eli Ginsberg urged the Conservative rabbis to professionalize the rabbinate.³ But his recommendation fell on deaf ears because it did not elicit, even among them, unanimity of opinion. The voices in opposition beckoned the rabbis to a calling which somehow precluded professional status. "The rabbinate is not merely a profession but . . . for most of us a vocation." "I am not sure that you can apply the same standards that one applies to other professions and unions . . . we have some messiahs and it is hard for us to think of a union of messiahs."⁴ But with the 1970 resolution we see the attempt to give birth to yet a new type of Conservative rabbi, the professional. What is still undetermined is whether we will see birth or stillbirth.

The best studies of work indicate that four characteristics are necessary, if not always sufficient, for an occupation to be rated as a profession:

1. *expertise*—the technical competence and specialized knowledge that legitimizes one's work.
2. *specialized training*—this same competence and knowledge stems from education or apprenticeship.
3. *service*—the work one does is regarded, not solely as a means of income but, rather, as a life-long commitment of dedication.
4. *autonomy*—the professional enjoys maximum personal responsibility and initiative, but minimum supervision.

To what extent are each of these qualifications already present, or at least reasonable, goals for the Conservative rabbinate?

It is because of the nature of the American-Jewish society which he serves that the Conservative rabbi has developed clear and special expertise. Ironically, the kind of professional expertise which is his leaves him personally frustrated.

In the Eastern European *shtetl* the rabbi's main function was the study of Jewish texts. He was the highest legal, religious and scholastic representative of the Jewish community. Pastoral duties, such as visiting the sick, comforting the bereaved and even preaching were eagerly carried out by laymen. What has made the rabbi the possessor of expertise in so many areas is the abdication, by laymen in this country, of the kinds of pastoral functions which are jocularly summarized as "hatching, matching, and dispatching" (birth, weddings, and funerals). The rabbi is expert in so many areas because no one else wants to do them.

It was Salo Baron who pointed out that in an age of specialization

3. *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, 1960, p. 137.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 102.

it is the rabbi who has, paradoxically, despecialized. A comprehensive study of the Conservative Rabbinate in 1971, by the Martin Segal Company, found that no less than seventeen separate and distinct functions are carried out by the Conservative rabbi.⁵ Whereas the psychiatrist might be capable of counseling more expertly, the professor of teaching more clearly, and the speechwriter of writing more interesting orations, none of these is in the unique position of the rabbi who executes all these functions together. He is an expert in despecialization, and, in this sense, a professional.

This expertise has been called many "dirty" names. Hertzberg, himself a rabbi, has identified the American Conservative rabbi somewhat disdainfully as an "institutional executive." Salo Baron calls him the "financial manager of his congregation."⁶ Eli Ginsberg most poignantly denies any value whatsoever to rabbinical expertise which is "wasteful of a serious person's time . . . this performance as a jack of all trades makes no sense today."⁷ It is pulpit rabbis, themselves, who voice the greatest frustration with this strange kind of expertise which has been foisted upon them. Their complaint is that they spend the greatest amount of time in matters which they regard as least important. While teaching is considered most crucial for many of them, they spend only eight out of a median fifty-four weekly hours in that activity.⁸ The kind of mastery which they idealize is that of religious text, but sheer survival requires that they be masters of everything from warmth of personality to manipulation of persons. Thus we see that, even though the Conservative rabbis enjoy professional expertise, that expertise leaves them personally frustrated.

This expertise is a direct result of the rabbi's fulfillment of the second quality of professionalism—specialized training. Ironically, here, too, professional and personal fulfillment are not synonymous.

Louis Finkelstein, retired Chancellor of The Jewish Theological Seminary, conceives of the ideal rabbi as a person with sufficient knowledge of Talmud to decide questions of religious law. The curriculum which he shaped in quest of this image concentrated on Talmud and *halakhah* (Jewish law) in an attempt at recreating "19th century Eastern European Jewish life."⁹ Unfortunately, the realities of Jewish life in Fargo, North Dakota, or even in Metuchen, New Jersey, do not require thorough knowledge of Jewish law. As a matter of fact, to the ex-

5. Martin E. Segal Company (Consultants and Actuaries), *The Conservative Rabbi: An Economic and Professional Profile* (New York: 1971), p. 55.

6. Salo W. Baron, *Steeled By Adversity* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971), p. 149.

7. *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, 1960, p. 27.

8. Martin E. Segal, *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

9. Charles S. Liebman, "The Training of American Rabbis," *American Jewish Yearbook*, 1968 (New York: The American Jewish Committee and JPS, 1968), p. 108.

tent that the Conservative rabbi spends his time acquiring this specialized knowledge, thus, necessarily, precluding involvement in the manifold duties which are required of him, he may suffer dire consequences. This same disparity between the specialized training of the Seminaries and the needs of the actual ministry is not limited to the rabbinate, but extends to all American religious denominations.¹⁰ Here, too, what the Conservative rabbi gains professionally he loses personally.

Service orientation, the third prerequisite of professionalism, is already a part of the rabbi's portfolio. The rabbinate is work which is not regarded solely as a means of income, but a life-long commitment. Typically, his service orientation, too, is fraught with all kinds of personal disappointments. In no other profession is there an inherent contradiction between service to others and personal remuneration. But from the very beginning of his education, the rabbi is encouraged to suspect an incompatibility between the two. Dr. Finkelstein's own attitude, imparted to Seminary students, is that "when you begin to be a rabbi, the salary you will receive the first year is one million dollars, plus what the congregation will give you."¹¹ That some rabbis themselves have internalized this view is indicated in the very statement by one rabbi that "it would be unseemly to say that the rabbi works on the Sabbath."¹² Of course, regardless of the spiritual quality of the rabbi's Sabbath duties, what he does is, indeed, expenditure of great energy, while the super-market will not accept Dr. Finkelstein's mythical million dollars.

Rabbis share this dichotomy between service and salary with their non-Jewish counterparts. In a study of altruistic professions, by T. Parsons, clergymen, in general, are depicted as being among the most altruistic. In another study, Protestant ministers noted their financial insecurity as their main complaint, yet at the same time they feel too guilty to demand larger salaries for fear of being overconcerned with money.¹⁴ Who does not suspect even the most dedicated clergyman who drives a Cadillac, although there is certainly no suspicion of the service orientation of a hardworking doctor who drives up in a Mercedes-Benz.

Yet studies show that motivations for entering the ministry are frequently no different from those which draw people to other occupations. The writer of a doctoral thesis which compared two generations of Seminary graduates concludes that the choice of the ministry was not the result of a special "call" but, rather, a deliberate choice of distinct pro-

10. Ivan A. Vallier, "Religious Specialists," *IESS* (New York: Macmillan Co.), vol. XIII, pp. 444-453.

11. *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, 1970, p. 157.

12. Martin E. Segal, *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

13. T. Parsons, *The Professions and Social Structure: Essays in Sociological Theory* (Illinois: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 34-49.

14. Linda S. Elfenbein, *Career Change in the Ministry* (M. A. Thesis, Political Science Dept., Columbia University, 1970), p. 15.

fessional advantage: opportunity for study, relationship to people rather than to things, and a certain degree of status.¹⁵ Parsons has clearly shown that there is little difference of altruistic motivation between the businessman and the professional.¹⁶ Certainly, then, the emerging, "professional type" rabbi is no exception. How can the dichotomy between rabbinic service and rabbinic remuneration not be distressing to him?

It is argued, of course, that what the clergyman loses in income he gains in prestige. It might be comforting to the financially struggling clergyman that answers to the question, "Which one of these groups do you feel is doing the most for the country at the present time?" placed religious leaders third in 1942 and first in 1947.¹⁷ Perhaps it is scarcity of personnel in a given occupation which brings increased functional importance and high prestige. Whatever the reason, even so critical an observer as C. Liebman concludes that "the rabbi is the most important figure in American Jewish life today."¹⁸ Prestige replaces pennies.

Unfortunately, the clergyman is not encouraged to believe this. It is significant that "most Conservative parents rank other professions far ahead of the rabbinate."¹⁹ It is equally true that at least the emerging professional rabbi is beginning to question the incongruence between salary and service. Precipitating the 1970 resolution at the Rabbinical Convention was an address by one of the younger men urging that rabbis "must seek adequate livelihood and concern with their personal welfare . . . idealism alone cannot provide food and clothing for a rabbi's family." That this change in attitude has already permeated future rabbis now "in training" was indicated in the Charles Liebman study which found that Jewish Theological Seminary students who are close to ordination tended to expect greater financial rewards from the rabbinate than did first year students.²⁰

Nevertheless, it remains to be seen if this self-image will be aborted. Not all rabbis have resolved in their own minds the alleged contradiction between salary and service. The Jewish Digest of April 1971 reported about a rabbi who was so irritated when a congregant asked him how much he charged for a wedding that he published a sarcastic bulletin article containing a mock scale of prices. More than embarrassment, this kind of overreaction indicates that some rabbis have not yet reconciled, even to themselves, the projected higher income of real professionalism with the altruistic service which they allegedly render.

15. Maynard L. Cassady, *A Comparative Study of Two Generations of Theological Graduates* (Ph.D. Thesis, Columbia University, 1934), p. 161.

14. Parsons, *Op. cit.*, pp. 34-49.

17. Elmo Roper, quoted in Will Herberg, *Catholic, Protestant and Jew* (New York: Anchor Books, 1960), p. 58.

18. Liebman, *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

19. Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism* (Illinois: The Free Press, 1955), p. 196.

20. Liebman, *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

The Conservative rabbi does, then, possess three prerequisites of professional status: expertise, specialized training, and service orientation, in spite of the personal frustration and inconsistencies which the very fulfillment of these requirements creates. But it is really the fourth condition of professionalism which the Conservative rabbinate does not at all possess, and until it is achieved, those who aspire to rabbinic professionalism are deluding themselves. That qualification is autonomy.

It was Marshall Sklare who most clearly documented how, historically, the Conservative Movement has been lay-oriented. Laymen fashioned rabbis in their own image. They initiated whatever changes they wanted in synagogue life and chose rabbis who preached, educated, and reinforced those changes. The personal result, for the rabbi, was that he had the worst of both worlds. Normally, a professional man accepts a salaried position when he wants to exchange income for greater security, whereas a self-employed professional prefers the greater income and will take the risk of less security. It is the rabbi, alone, among professionals, who must suffer longer hours, less security, and lower income. His job combines the worst aspects of the free and salaried professionals while enjoying none of the advantages. The backdrop for that 1970 resolution was a demand by Rabbi William Lebeau that "the necessity for many (rabbis) to curry the favor of his *ba'alei batim* in hopeful anticipation of improving his financial position is to many of us distasteful and potentially destructive."²¹ The Martin Segal study which resulted from that resolution revealed that high on the list of rabbinic complaints was the feeling of being a "hired hand." A joke now popular tells of a rabbi who, when asked if the eventuality of his winning the state lottery would cause him to retire from the rabbinate, responds, "No, but my sermons would surely be a lot different." Insecurity in their jobs is the most felt hindrance to preaching and teaching in the rabbinate. Autonomy, the prized possession of real professions, is not at all the property of the rabbi, and blocks whatever aspirations to total professionalism which he might have.

This lack of autonomy cuts across religious lines. The prime reason, besides low salaries, for Episcopalian ministers to leave their profession is dependence on parishioners. Conversely, those clergy belonging to strong denominational organizations have a lower rate of turnover than those controlled by lay parishioners.²²

It is easier to diagnose the problem than to find a solution for the lack of rabbinic professionalism. One suggestion has been to strengthen the Rabbinical Assembly as a professional organization, with the ex-

21. William Lebeau, "The Rabbinical Assembly, A Look Toward the Future," *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, 1970, pp. 96-108.

22. Elliot A. Krause, *The Sociology of Occupations* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1971), p. 183.

pressed purpose of protecting its member rabbis against the abuses of "congregationalism." One of the frequent criticisms of The Rabbinical Assembly, as uncovered in the Martin Segal study, has been this lack "of moral support of colleagues in dealing with the congregation." Eli Ginsberg recommended, as far back as 1960, that rabbis organize themselves into a more effective "trade association." Interestingly, much of the resistance to this kind of solution comes from those more powerful rabbis who are really in a position to effect a change. Wolfe Kelman, executive director of The Rabbinical Assembly, has expressed his own feelings that he "... is not sure there isn't something to be said for the more free-wheeling and more elastic situation that exists here."²³ Of course, it is more free-wheeling for only the strongest of rabbis, whereas in the average situation the elastic stretches in the direction of congregational power and away from rabbinic autonomy. Kelman's view is unacceptable in the face of studies by sociologists like Peter Blau who have concluded that employment security is an absolute prerequisite for people to assume responsibility for innovation.²⁴

More radical solutions have included the socialization of rabbinic salaries and the actual unionization of the rabbinate, perhaps even affiliation with the AFL-CIO. But the achievement of autonomy need not come through such extreme measures. Minor but vigorous adjustments would be sufficient. The Martin Segal study discouraged an episcopal type organization in favor of minimum salary standards guidelines, with the individual rabbi and congregation free to negotiate beyond that point. The mere insistence on some kind of salary standards by the parent organization would automatically bestow on a rabbi greater autonomy and, hence, a greater measure of professionalism. The Rabbinical Assembly recently took an important first step in providing its members with model contracts to be utilized, with the help with attorneys, when negotiating with congregations. But total autonomy and, therefore, total professionalization will come about only when The Rabbinical Assembly itself provides the moral and legal backing for what is negotiated. That will finally happen when the all-important function of rabbinate placement is withheld from those congregations which do not live up to minimum standards and minimum conditions of model contracts. This kind of power has not yet been utilized, nor is there any plan to do so. With power will come autonomy. In spite of his fulfilling the other three requirements of professionalism, it is when, and only when, the Conservative rabbi achieves autonomy that he can be truly called a professional in the fullest sense of the word.

23. *Rabbinical Assembly Proceedings*, 1960, p. 72.

24. Peter Blau, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society* (New York: Random House, 1956), p. 61.

FROM
FORTRESS PRESS

JESUS ON TRIAL

by
**GERARD S.
SLOYAN**

Chairman, Department
of Religion
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pa.

Paper—\$3.75

AN IRENIC APPRAISAL of a CONTROVERSIAL ISSUE

by a noted
Roman Catholic scholar

Well aware of tensions between Christians and Jews arising from Gospel evidence about Jesus' trial, Dr. Sloyan argues that the Romans bear the chief, if not the sole, responsibility for Jesus' death.

"JESUS ON TRIAL is by far the best book I have ever read in this area, in terms of its excellent scholarship, its admirable tone, and the author's fairness and sense of balance. Professor Sloyan has put us all in his debt. Professor Reumann's Introduction lives up to his well-known standard of integrity and perception."

Samuel Sandmel
Hebrew Union College

If Not Available at Your Bookstore Mail This Coupon to Fortress Press

Please send me _____ copy(ies) of JESUS ON TRIAL. 1-1033

My check/M.O. in the amount of \$ _____ is enclosed.

Please charge my account ☐

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

STATE _____

ZIP _____

2900 Queen Lane
Philadelphia
Pennsylvania 19129



Purposeful Books of Contemporary Religious Thought

IN PRAISE OF REASON

Review-Essay by TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN

Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism. By HERMANN COHEN. Translated, with an Introduction, by Simon Kaplan. Introductory Essay by Leo Strauss. Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. New York, 1972. xliii + 489 pp. \$15.00.

IN HIS 50-PAGE "INTRODUCTION" TO COHEN'S *Juedische Schriften*,¹ Franz Rosenzweig deplored the fact that, with respect to Jewish thought, "the circle under his [Cohen's] personal influence remained small. He did not conquer the 'West,' which rushed to altars where the service required was less demanding."² Today, more than half a century after the publication of Cohen's *Religion der Vernunft*, in 1919, a year after his death in 1918,³ the impact of his Jewish philosophy is still muted. The West is still rushing to less demanding philosophical "altars."

Rosenzweig noted that Cohen was hurt by the neglect by "his Jews," especially after his retirement from Marburg University, where he taught for 36 years. That he had made Marburg "an intellectual center of worldwide renown" did not console him. Nor did his fame as the founder of the Neo-Kantian School and as the author of its classical works assuage his hurt for being unappreciated by "his Jews."

The "difficulty" of Cohen's style and thought have been cited as reasons for the neglect of his Jewish philosophy. But Cohen is not "difficult" for those who know German. His style is precise and his Jewish thought is set forth with the clarity of the thinker who "finds the right word because he has a clear concept" (Goethe). The reason Cohen was

1. *Veroeffentlichungen der Akademie fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, Berlin, 1924.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. xxxix.

3. *Religion of Reason* was published in 1919, under the title of *Die Religion der Vernunft*. The second, revised edition of 1928, has the title, *Religion der Vernunft*. The definite article was omitted in accordance with Cohen's instructions that had been overlooked in the preparation of the first edition. This seemingly minor matter is important. Cohen considered Judaism an exemplary manifestation of reason, but he was far from proclaiming it *The* "religion of reason." He regarded it as "*The Religion of Reason*" in time but as "*Religion of Reason*" *sub specia aeternitatis*. Regrettably, Cohen's *magnum opus* is almost inevitably referred to, and quoted, with the definite article, according to the first edition.

TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN is editor of "*The Jewish Spectator*."

"neglected" by "his Jews" is that his magnum opus, *Religion der Vernunft*, as well as the three volumes of his essays on Jewish themes (*Juedische Schriften*), were published after his death. The impact of his essays, published in various journals during his life, did not suffice to establish him as a Jewish philosopher. His fame and reputation were associated with his four volumes of critical reinterpretation of Kant (*Kants Theorie der Erfahrung*, *Kants Begrueundung der Ethik*, *Kants Einflus auf die Deutsche Kultur*, and *Kants Begrueundung der Aesthetik*) and the three volumes of his own philosophy, *Logik der Reinen Erkenntnis*, *Die Ethik des Reinen Willens*, and *Die Aesthetik des Reinen Gefuehls*.

Cohen's place in Jewish philosophy was problematical to his contemporaries because, unlike all those who figure in the history of Jewish philosophy, his main work was not in Jewish thought. Although he was never "estranged" from Jewishness, as has been alleged, he was wholly immersed in Kantian revisionism during his Marburg years. It was only on special occasions, especially when Judaism needed to be defended against its detractors, that Cohen wrote on Jewish themes.

If books are, indeed, subject to the vagaries of fate (Cohen denied any validity to "fate"), the publication of the English translation of *Religion der Vernunft*, at this time, is far from being "auspicious."

Cohen was a "pure" rationalist and his Jewish philosophy, too, is based on *ratio*. Today, however, rationalism has suffered an almost crushing defeat as the result of the victory of Existentialism. Culturally and philosophically, ours is the age of "the nemesis of authority," as Robert Nisbet describes the "worship of the absurd . . . that leaves psychedelic experience almost the only way out,"⁴ when reason is discredited and rejected.

Today, "relevance" is "the magic word."⁵ In Jewish philosophy, the worship of "relevance" is manifest in the almost uncontested sway of religious Existentialism, especially of Buber's School. Existentialists do "their own thing" in Jewish thought, oriented by the "relevance" of *their personal religious experience*. Cohen is not "relevant" for most contemporary "doers of Jewish theology" because he set great store by REASON—and REASON, the worshippers of the absurd proclaim, is *no longer* "relevant."

REASON, however, is not in need of defense. And Cohen's *Religion of Reason* certainly requires no apologia vis-a-vis the so-called *Zeitgeist*. However, it is imperative to disabuse the detractors of reason of the notion that reason is cold and impersonal. Reading Cohen, one realizes that REASON is a special type of passion—the passion which those who flit from "experience" to "experience" will neither understand nor ap-

4. R. Nisbet, "The Nemesis of Authority," *Encounter*, August 1972, p. 12.

5. Herbert J. Muller, *In Pursuit of Relevance* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1971), p. 152.

preciate. Kant's "Categorical Imperative" was born of *that* passion. Saadia's and Maimonides' demythologizations of the Hebrew Bible, too, are instinct with this passion—and so is Cohen's *Religion of Reason*. His God idea, which emphasizes the *uniqueness* of God, in contradistinction to oneness, is carefully and rationally developed, with ample quotations of text and commentary. But the philosophical exposition is suffused with the passion of the believer. Cohen was not a detached rationalist. He was *engagé* in the fullest sense of the word, *engagé* because of his conviction that "the cohesion of religion and rational knowledge is the secure ground for the virtue of truthfulness . . . For the systematic connection of all the questions of knowledge, God is the principle of Truth."

The key concept of Cohen's Jewish philosophy is "correlation." He saw the essential significance of religion in providing the basis for "the correlation" of man with his fellows. This "correlation" is expressed and becomes manifest in active ethical concern and caring. It is only *after* this correlation is firmly established that man can reach out and hope for the correlation with God.

Cohen defined correlation as "the encounter" of God and man in the active concern of *Mitleid* (literally, "suffering with") for the poor and stricken. "Correlation," as defined by Cohen, means that "the other person" is not *another* but a fellow-and-neighbor *because* of God's concern for him. It is this divine concern which fuses mankind into a with-ethical-purpose-charged community, obliging each and every person to identify each and every other person as a "fellow-human."

Cohen first introduced the term and concept "correlation" in his essay, *Liebe und Gerechtigkeit in den Begriffen Gott und Mensch*, published in 1900.⁶ If one were to substitute "dialogue" for "correlation" and "thou" for fellowman in this essay, and in the many other contexts where Cohen defined and elaborated on "correlation," one would be hard put to differentiate between Cohen's "correlation" and Buber's "dialogue."

Buber's *I and Thou* was published in 1923, five years after Cohen's death, twenty-three years after the publication of Cohen's *Liebe und Gerechtigkeit in den Begriffen Gott und Mensch*, and four years after the appearance of *Religion der Vernunft*. In *I and Thou*, Buber neither referred to nor acknowledged Cohen's contribution to the dialogical principle. It was only years later that he alluded to it in "The History of the Dialogical Principle."⁷ Buber did not explain what finally made him acknowledge, in part, one must add, Cohen's concept of "correlation" and Rosenzweig's and Ferdinand Ebner's contributions to "The Dialogical

6. *Juedische Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 43 ff.

7. M. Buber, *Between Man and Man*, tr. by Ronald Gregor Smith, with an Introduction by Maurice Friedman (New York: Macmillan, 1965), pp. 209 ff.

Principle.”⁸ However, Buber did feel the need to defend his integrity as an author and thinker. He wrote:

At this point I must speak for myself. The question of the possibility of a dialogical relationship between man and God had already accosted me in my youth. . . . In the language of the writings on the dialogical principle that arose many years later, it appears emphatically for the first time in the autumn of 1907 in the introduction to my book *The Legends of the Baal-Shem*. . . . The clarification took place first of all here too in connection with my interpretation of Hasidism; in the preface written in September 1919, to my book *Der Grosse Maggid und seine Nachfolger* (1921). . . . Soon after, in the autumn of 1919, followed the first, still unwieldy draft of *I and Thou*.⁹

Buber continued:

There now followed two years in which I could do almost no work, except on Hasidic material, but also—with the exception of Descartes' *Discours de la methode*, which I again took up—read no philosophica (therefore the works connected with the subject of dialogue by Cohen, Rosenzweig and Ebner I read only later, too late to affect my own thought).¹⁰

In a footnote referring to the works of the three thinkers, Buber refers to Cohen's *Religion der Vernunft*, but not to his essay of 1900, *Liebe und Gerechtigkeit*, nor to several of Cohen's essays published many years before 1907, when Buber's Introduction to *The Legends of the Baal Shem* appeared.

Maurice Friedman, Buber's translator, cites evidence which he considers “irrefutable,” of Buber's originality. Be this at it may, what matters is that the virtual identity of Cohen's “correlation” and Buber's “dialogue” goes to prove that communication of “Existence” (i.e. God) with “existing” (man) and, flowing therefrom, the correlation (or dialogue) of “existing with existing” (i.e. man with fellowman) are not mutually exclusive.

Cohen's *Religion of Reason*, as well as his *Juedische Schriften*, demolish the notion that *reason* and *emotion*—especially the emotion of love—are opposite-poles contradictions.

Cohen's Jewish philosophy is firmly anchored in his Neo-Kantian system. When Cohen posited that Judaism as “pure religion” focuses on ethical deeds, derived from divine teachings, and not on speculation about the nature of God, he applied a conclusion of his *Ethik des Reinen Willens* (1907). There he argued that mythology, which personifies God, is interested in the *person* of God. Judaism progressively eliminated or reinterpreted anthropomorphic notions, to the extent where Maimonides, to whose rationalism Cohen paid frequent tribute, even questioned the possibility of ascribing the attribute of “living” to God.

Cohen's religious philosophy is consistently this-worldly. He abhorred

8. *Das Wort und die geistigen Realitaeten*, 1921.

9. Buber, *Between Man and Man*, pp. 213 ff.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 215.

mythology and supernaturalism. For him, the Messianic Age and the Hereafter are states of ethical perfection. Unlike the mythological fantasies of the Golden Age of the past projected as a second return in the future, Cohen delineated the Age of the Messiah as the time of mankind united, when peace and social justice will be universally established. He considered the dynamics of "the ethical volition" as the motor force of the striving for *perfectibility* as distinguished from *perfection*, or mythological notion when associated with mortals.

Cohen stressed that the Jewish messianic idea is metaphysical only to the extent that it is "beyond" the scientific-mathematical universe of discourse. It is, however, universal because it is concerned with mankind, and not only with the Jewish people.

Cohen defined "immortality" in keeping with the Jewish semantics of "being gathered unto one's people." It is the immortality of the individual in the historical continuity of his people. As for the immortality of the soul, Cohen defined it as the "selfhood" of the striving for holiness, i.e., the eternal task and challenge of "perfectibility."

Cohen equated Jewish law with ethics. Although it may seem that there is no ethical component in many Jewish rituals, Cohen argued that the ritual laws, by isolating Jews, help preserve Jewish monotheism. He considered the disadvantages of this isolation minimal as compared to its purpose.

When monotheism is in danger, how can one argue on behalf of the importance of general culture? With monotheism, civilization proper is at stake. The consideration of whether the law is a hindrance to cultural intercourse springs from hedonism and opportunism. . . . Isolation is indispensable for Judaism, for its idea, as well as for its cultural efforts and, thus, for its confessors.

Obviously, Cohen did not advocate the withdrawal of Jews from the general culture. What he argued for was the preservation of Jewish distinctiveness for the sake of mankind and civilization.

Respectful of Jewish traditions and observing them, Cohen regarded "the yoke of the commandments as a burden of manifest Divine love. "He who did not experience life under the yoke of the law will never be able to understand that this burden is being carried as if it were a ladder reaching unto heaven."

Far from being a cloistered scholar, Cohen frequently took an active part in Jewish affairs, especially in defending Judaism against the rabid "scientific" anti-Semitism of the historian, Heinrich von Treitschke, who coined the slogan, "The Jews are our misfortune." At the time of the Dreyfus trial, he demanded that the *Ehrenpflicht* (the duty of honor) be led into the field and, later, devoted an essay to the historical meaning of

11. *Ibid.*, Translators' Notes, pp. 214 ff.

the end of the Dreyfus Affair (*Der geschichtliche Sinn des Abschlusses der Affäre*).¹²

While Cohen was fully aware of the principal role of German scholars in elevating anti-Semitism to the dignity of a *Wissenschaft*, he yet maintained that the essence of "Germanism" and "Judaism" are virtually identical. An anti-Zionist, he regarded Germany and its culture as the ideational and ideal home of Jews and Judaism. He held that Jews must continue as a non-territorial people in the midst of the nations "like the divine dew."¹³

Cohen's mistaken assessment of the civilizational impact of German *Kultur*, especially its humane impact, was the tragic mistake of a rationalist philosopher who took it for granted that reason, and the ethics flowing from reason, had deep roots in the culture which provided the soil for Kant's philosophy.

* * *

Simon Kaplan's translation is literal, much too literal. He does not transmute the German idioms into idiomatic English. Cohen's precise and refined German style is not reflected in the translation. That Professor Kaplan is capable of writing on philosophy in a clear style is evident, however, from his "Translator's Introduction," a succinct summary of Cohen's thought.

Leo Strauss starts his brilliant "Introductory Essay" expressing doubt about whether he is "the best mediator between Hermann Cohen (1842-1918) and the present-day American reader." He certainly is *one* of the best.

It is unfortunate that the seventy-seven page index of the German edition has been omitted. It is the kind of very detailed analytical index for lack of which a volume, such as *Religion of Reason*, cannot serve as a ready reference tool. The two-and-a-half page Index of Proper Names and an Index of Hebrew words, of the same length, do not compensate for that omission. In this respect, too, Cohen has been neglected because "the service" required by providing an English counterpart of the second edition of *Religion der Vernunft* is too demanding.

12. *Juedische Schriften*, Vol. II, pp. 346 ff. and pp. 352 ff.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 335.

The Teachings of the Tradition

Masot V'mehkarim. By HAYYIM ZE'EV REINES. Jerusalem. Reuven Maas, 1972. 131 pp.

Reviewed by ISAAC KLEIN

RABBI REINES has already made us beholden to him with a number of books on the ethical teachings of the Bible and Rabbinic literature. This small book is a worthy addition to them. It is a collection of studies that touch upon the moral and ethical teaching of the Jewish tradition even when the subject of discussion is legal or merely the definition and the elucidation of terms and concepts.

Thus, in the first essay, he takes the verse from Jeremiah: "For instruction shall not perish from the priest, nor counsel from the wise nor the word from the prophet" (Jer. 18:18) and analyzes it. In it we have three subjects of instruction and the three types of teachers whose function it was to transmit them. The three subjects are instruction (*Torah*), counsel (*ezrah*) and the word (*davar*). The instructors are the priest, the wise man, and the prophet, and the author defines the subjects and the purpose for this instruction. The Torah was the word of God which the priest had to teach. The prophet stressed the moral principles of religion, and the wise man taught the wisdom of it. The distinction between the two is that, whereas Torah and prophecy stressed the social aspect of morality, wisdom stressed the benefits that accrue to the person himself. The priest and the prophet speak to the people, while the wise man speaks to the individual.

Lest we be prone to think that wisdom is the mere secular prudence of the hedonist, the author hastens to emphasize that what is meant here is the striving for the

perfection of the individual soul (*Shlemut hanefesh*), the permeation of the individual life with a religious spirit.

The purpose of all three is the same—to teach the ethical life—but each takes a different form. The form, however, is as essential as the content. (Is that an echo of Marshal MacLuhan?)

This sort of detailed analysis and break-down of concepts is followed in the study of honor (*kavod*), evil talk (*lashon hara*), kindness to animals, pain and the infliction thereof, and insult.

Thus, the case of insult is analyzed as follows: There are many kinds of humiliation that a man inflicts upon his fellowman. One is caused by omission, such as ignoring him, or, in the vernacular, by cold-shouldering him. It is a subtle way of showing disrespect for another man's personality, a most common form of causing humiliation.

On the commission side, there is the verbal insult. The nearest term in English would be to ridicule a man, or, in the vernacular, to make fun of him. This is a way of looking down upon a person, to be rude to him, to hold him in contempt. The Hebrew word, *l'batel*, is more devastating. It means to consider a person as naught.

Then there is insult through physical assault and injury. This injury, though physical, has, as its main purpose, not the infliction of physical pain, but the shame and humiliation which it causes.

We must also mention the insult that expresses itself in slanderous attacks and name calling. Included in this is insult by innuendo.

The author then brings in the insult that comes from class distinction. When one group considers itself superior to another and looks down on it with disdain,

when one nation or people holds another in contempt, that is a form of insult.

From here the author proceeds to describe what insult does to the parties involved. The insulter is arrogant, insensitive and heartless. The insulted and humiliated one may have the moral courage to make himself impervious and remain unhurt. More often, the insult causes a diminution in his stature and self-respect, and sometimes results in practical injury, such as the loss of a job.

Some of the studies have halakhic and historical implications. The chapter on espousal and nuptials in the halakhah is such a one. It explains the terms, their implications and the legalities which they entail. As is well known, the present form of the Jewish marriage ceremony consists of two parts which, originally, were separate, with about a year between them. The status of the espoused woman was complex. In some respects she had the status of a fully married woman, and in other respects she was still under the jurisdiction of her father. The author cites these seemingly contradictory regulations and explains them by giving the social and historical factors involved.

In the chapter on the acquisition (purchase) of the wife in the Bible and the Talmud, he goes to great pains to explain the distinction between acquisition and purchase, that they do not mean real purchase but, rather, indicate the rights and privileges which a man acquires through marriage. A good effort at apologetics, but not convincing.

In all of these analyses the author marshalls the pertinent passages in the Bible and the Talmud with great skill. In many cases the meaning of the quoted passages assumes a new clarity. The author has a good command of the mate-

rial and seems to summon the relevant quotations with ease, and the footnotes show his acquaintance with the subject in non-rabbinic and non-Jewish studies.

Reines follows the same method in his other chapters. He castigates the *maskilim* for accusing the rabbis of being divorced from real life, and, therefore, considering their ethical teachings as unrealistic and as operating in a vacuum. On the contrary, he claims; they were very much involved in life. Because of their constant dealing within Jewish law they had to be aware of what was going on in the workaday world, and they had to be acquainted with the nature of man. They had a healthy outlook on life and had an acute insight into its psychology.

This is a small book, but rich in content and most rewarding to the reader.

ISAAC KLEIN is Rabbi at Temple Shaarey Zedek of Buffalo; assistant professor of Jewish law and practice at the Jewish Theological Seminary and lecturer in medieval Jewish philosophy at SUNY, Buffalo.

•

Why We Do What We Do

Jewish Folkways in Germanic Lands (1648-1806). By HERMAN POLLACK. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press. 1971. 410 pp. \$15.00.

Reviewed by GERALD ENGEL

NOT TOO many years ago, a volume about Jewish folkways in Germanic lands between 1648 and 1806 would have interested scholars primarily. Today, youth searching for a meaningful life style delve into the past. *Jewish Folkways in Germanic Lands*, based upon hundreds of sources (in Hebrew, Yiddish, German, French, and English) is, therefore, also a people's bonanza.

Herman Pollack has uncovered a rich lode of customs that are the basis for American Jewish practices. For, by Jewish standards, this pre-emancipation period is yesterday.

Folkways can encompass all the social and cultural customs of individuals and groups. Pollack chose to limit his study to a consideration of *minhagim* related to: 1) life cycle—birth, marriage, and burial; 2) educational development; 3) physical existence—including dress, food and medicine; 4) synagogue customs and Sabbath and holiday observances. These major areas are discussed after a brief, but meaningful, introductory chapter which describes the physical surroundings of the *gas* and provides an insight into the interior of several ghetto homes—including the book-lined walls—thereby providing evidence for yesterday's Jews being known as the "People of the Book."

Pollack's methodology is patterned after the research habits of his teachers, including Harry A. Wolfson of Harvard, a Boston neighbor, and Salo W. Baron, under whom he studied at Columbia University. That half this volume is devoted to scholarly footnotes indicates the author's own high standards. The patient researcher sought out *gedolei hador* in his field to benefit from their comments and criticism. The scope of his endeavor is indicated in his organization of the fifty-page bibliography. The four sections include bibliographical and bio-bibliographical sources; manuscripts; other primary sources; and secondary sources concerning German-Jewish communal, social and cultural life, folk attitudes and practices.

The volume also includes sources often unavailable to those without a knowledge of Hebrew. Included

are works dealing with: responsa (*she-elot u-teshuvot*) pertaining to daily life; communal legislation found in *takkanot*; the customs observable in community minute books (*pinkasim*); ethical treatises (*musar*); ethical wills (*zavvaot*); homilies (*drash*); the code of law (*Shulhan Arukh*); and autobiographical works in Yiddish, German, and French.

Herman Pollack writes in a simple, narrative style, reflecting a lifetime bound up with collegians whom he devotedly served as a Hillel Foundation director. He avoids sounding scholarly, yet his carefully researched findings are footnoted and elaborated upon in the second part of this volume. The first section will please those who want facts told succinctly, while the second is a scholar's delight. Most readers will undoubtedly find themselves also scanning some of the footnotes, stimulated to learn more about specific current topics.

Sefardi Jews (those of Spanish background) began to arrive in colonial days; they followed the customs of Spain, Portugal and Holland. The majority of Jews in America observe Ashkenazi (Germanic) customs, related to Eastern Europe and the Western lands of Franco-Germany. It is assumed that the more traditional Ashkenazi customs were brought to this country by emigrants from the more backward Eastern European lands of the Czar, while Reform practices are the heritage of those who came out of the industrialized West. However, in describing the customs of Jews who lived within the geographic bounds of the old Holy Roman Empire, including Austria, Bohemia and Moravia, Pollack indicates that the Ashkenazim in the West continued to follow traditional customs even as Reform synagogue *minhagim* were instituted.

The author, a liberal rabbi, presents traditional holiday and home practices, limiting his reporting of Reform to the synagogue.

A people whose life style remained essentially unchanged since the Middle Ages had little inclination for religious innovations. State officials authorized the establishment of Jewish communities to further economic growth following the Thirty Years War, but these officials did not invite Jews to live in their neighborhoods. Jews continued to live in the *gas*, though they had world-wide business connections with co-religionists, and traded with Christian merchants. They spoke Yiddish, and continued to wear the prescribed yellow star of David as well as distinctive garb. Ghetto life was economically secure during this era of economic growth, but there was always the possibility of expulsion from the many city-states.

Jews living within the ghetto, conscious of social and political differences, did not easily identify with their gentile neighbors. Yet some changes were introduced into the Sabbath services, reflecting church decorum and church music. Herman Pollack never suggests why Jews living in Prague, with its history of expulsion, became committed forerunners of synagogue reforms that were imitative of their persecutors, though the innovators referred to ancient Temple customs.

Traditionalism was reinforced, even after the limited Western Emancipation of Jews from rural Eastern Europe. They came in large numbers following the Chmelnicki pogroms, and Eastern European refugees continued thereafter to strengthen traditionalism, until Hitler destroyed the entire community.

Sketches included in this book provide a pictorial view of yester-

day's customs. Fashion changes are quite noticeable, and some customs have become outmoded. There is a photo of a circumcision bench from the Synagogue of Zulz, Upper Silesia, 1782. The Hebrew writing identifies it as the chair of Elijah on which the child was circumcised. Pollack suggests that Elijah was so honored because of his zeal in maintaining this custom in the face of royal opposition.

Today, the mohel makes passing reference to this chair of Elijah, which has been replaced by a form-fitting board on which the child is securely tied. The *sandak* has given up the time-honored tradition of holding the child in his lap during the circumcision, yet the *sandak* still continues. Sometimes, today, a woman celebrant is happy to serve as *kvaterin*, who hands over the child to the *kvater*, who then presents the boy to the *sandak*.

The author cites Rabbinic responsa to indicate that a child may be named after a living person. However, few Freudian-oriented Ashkenazim in America would consider naming their child after a living dear one, who might begin to feel replaced. Sefardim, with fewer psychological hangups, continue to name a child after a living relative.

The section on education deals with the past, yet comparison between yesterday and today is inevitable. Then, education was unending. The three year old boy was often brought into the *heder* to lick honey off the first page which he studied. His parents paid for his elementary education, though the community often guaranteed the *melamed* his tuition. Higher education was never a luxury, and towns with as few as thirty families recognized their responsibility to establish a *yeshivah*.

In every community, men were expected to study in the morning

before services and again at the end of the day. Rabbis sometimes complained about people not living up to standards in the field of education and being lax about other practices; however, these standards were accepted by the people.

In yesterday's ghetto world the individual considered his Jewish identification total, encompassing both work-day as well as leisure hours. *Jewish Folkways* points out that the rabbi was the scholar who provided legal opinion about business ethics just as he explained traditions relating to holidays and diet. Nowhere is there mention of the preacher or minister to the sick.

The volume considers certain lenient customs indirectly. This challenges the more rigorous *minhagim* in effect today. Several outstanding rabbis accepted the practice of not asking individuals to wait any length of time between meat and dairy dishes. It was Ramah who personally accepted the Sefardic tradition of waiting six hours. Reasons for differences are known to rabbis, but to only few laymen. *Jewish Folkways* now makes this information available to all who desire to winnow the wheat from the chaff.

Questions relating to the mourners' *kaddish* remain vital. At one time, a scholar, in response to a direct query, advised that a daughter had the right to say *kaddish* after a deceased parent when there were no brothers. This same issue troubled the Brownsville community in Brooklyn about thirty years ago. Cronies of my deceased uncle decided, by themselves, that the dead man would be honored if the youngest of his three daughters said *kaddish*. The decision made, they drank a *lehayyim* to their own health and also wished the dead man's soul an *aliyah*. Seated in their store synagogue, they illustrated the rabbinic axiom, "The

Children of Israel, if they are not prophets, are at least the sons of prophets."

This volume does not try specifically to bridge the gap between past and future. Herman Pollack is an historian, not a *posek*. He presents customs, however, that may have significance in today's world. The *erev tavshilin* permits a person to walk double the 2,000 *els* when he places a dish of food at the end of the prescribed distance, thereby establishing his dwelling. This concern for the *erev* may appear hopelessly outdated, yet has been reintroduced by American youth. At Camp B'nai B'rith, a Sabbath *erev hazerot* makes the whole camping area a partnership, thereby permitting carrying on the Sabbath. Knowledge of such customs may also help explain to tourists in Israel why pious dwellers of Meah Shearim carry in Jerusalem on the Sabbath.

Herman Pollack maintains an objective stance throughout the volume. Only toward the very end does this liberal rabbi indicate his attachment to the ghetto when he distinguishes between acceptable folk practices related to demons and outright magic.

The popular customs that protect against demons are not necessarily magical, as is often implied. The distinction between a superstitious practice and magic has to be made in terms of the specific situation, not in broad generalities.

Rabbi Pollack's next volume ought to be less antiseptic and more partisan. It is to be hoped that *Jewish Folkways* will be well received, encouraging the author to write a sequel in which he will both assess the past and consider the future.

GERALD ENGEL is Hillel Director of Purdue University.

In a time of great challenge . . . A medium of informed discussion

*For a searching examination and a richer
understanding of the problems facing the
world, Israel, and Jewry today . . .*

midstream **A MONTHLY JEWISH REVIEW**

Articles / Essays / Fiction / Verse / Book Reviews

Recent issues have included these important contributions,
which have aroused widespread discussion:

- **Shlomo Avineri: Israel: Two Nations?**
- **Paul Blumberg, Ernst Pawel:
The Kibbutz Today**
- **Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher:
Christianity Threatened in Israel?**
- **Walter Ackerman: The Present
Moment in Jewish Education**
- **Ben Halpern, Leonard Fine: On Quotas**
- **Marie Syrkin: Political Terrorism or
Plain Murder?**

**SUBSCRIBE
NOW!
SPECIAL
INTRODUCTORY
OFFER FOR NEW
SUBSCRIBERS
ONLY**

MIDSTREAM

515 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022

Enter my subscription for one year at \$4.00 (\$10.00
value). Remittance enclosed.

Name.....

Address.....

City..... State..... Zip.....

Articles

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
ABRAMOWITZ, MAYER	Sanctification of The Moon: Ancient Rite of Rebellion	45
ALEXANDER, EDWARD	Imagining the Holocaust: Mr. Sammler's Planet and Others	288
ALONI, SHULAMIT	The Status of The Woman in Israel	248
BENTWICH, JOSEPH S.	The State of Religion in Israel	151
BERKOVITS, ELIEZER	Approaching the Holocaust	18
BERMAN, SAUL J.	The Extended Notion of the Sabbath	342
BOWLER, MAURICE G.	Rosenzweig on Judaism and Christianity—The Two Covenant Theory	475
CHIEL, ARTHUR A.	The Mystery of the Rabbi's Lost Portrait	482
COHEN, JACK J.	The Jewishness of Israel's Youth	173
ELIZUR, JUDITH NEULANDER	Women in Israel	237
FEIN, LEONARD J.	Israel or Zion	7
FEINGOLD, HENRY L.	The Jewish Radical in His American Habitat	92
FISHER, EUGENE	Typical Jewish Misunderstandings of Christianity	21
GARBER, FREDRICK	The Art of Elie Wiesel	301
GINSBURG, SAUL M.	Peter Shafiroff—"Jewish" Adviser to Peter the Great	409
GOLDSTEIN, ISRAEL	Interfaith Relations in Israel	202
GORDIS, ROBERT	Jews as Political Figures	400
	The Wonder of The Age and The Ages—A Salute to Israel	132
GREENBERG, SIDNEY	Reactions to the Rabbinical Assembly Mahzor	440
HAVAZELET, MEIR	Maimonides as a Young Man	79
HERMAN, SIMON N.	The Youth: Jews, Israelis or Both?	167
HERST, ROGER E.	A. D. Gordon: On Social Nationalism	328
	Maimonides as a Physician	84
KAPLAN, EDWARD	Three Dimensions of Human Fullness: Poetry, Love and Prayer	309
KEREM, MOSHE	The Kibbutz: The State of The Dream	182
LEVIN, LEONARD	Whither Conservative Liturgy?	433

<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Page</i>
LEVIN, S.	The Orphan Syndrome	33
LEWIS, CHAIM	From Adam's Serpent to Abraham's Ram	392
LITTELL, FRANKLIN H.	Christians and Jews in the Historical Process	263
LIVNEH, ELIEZER	The Jewish Way of War	157
MILCH, ROBERT	An Encounter with the "Akedah"	397
NASH, STANLEY	Shay Hurwitz, A Pioneering Polemicist for Truth	322
NINI, YEHUDA	The Ingathering of the Exiles	210
OLAN, LEVI A.	A New Prayer Book—Conservative Judaism Defines Itself	418
RISKIN, STEVEN	"Modern" Prayer—At What Sacrifice?	426
SANDMEL, SAMUEL	The Enjoyment of Scripture: An Esthetic Approach	455
SCHNALL, DAVID J.	Dialectic Zionism	334
SCHONEVELD, COOS	Towards a New Jewish-Christian Understanding in Israel	194
SCHULTZ, JOSEPH	Jewish Militarism and Jewish Survival	468
SHAPIRO, CLAIRE B. (tr.)	Peter Shafiroff—"Jewish" Adviser to Peter the Great	409
SHERWIN, BYRON L.	Bar-Mizvah	53
SINGER, SHOLOM A.	Moses: Faith and Law	38
SPERO, SHUBERT	Is the God of Maimonides Truly Unknowable?	66
STEINSALZ, ADIN	Religion in The State of Israel	140
VOGEL, DAN	Cahan's "Rise of David Levinsky": Archetype of American Jewish Fiction	278
YUVAL, ANNABELLE	The Israeli Woman	224
ZELIZER, VIVIANA A. AND GERALD W.	The Conservative Rabbinate— In Quest of Professionalism	490

Reviews

<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Book and Author</i>	<i>Page</i>
ENGEL, GERALD	Jewish Folkways in Germanic Lands (1648–1806), by Herman Pollack	505
KAHN, LOTHAR	The Mendelssohns: Three Generations of Genius, by Herbert Kupferberg	117

<i>Reviewer</i>	<i>Book and Author</i>	<i>Page</i>
KLEIN, ISAAC	Masot V'mehkarim by Hayyim Ze'ev Reines	504
LEWIS, THEODORE N.	Hannah Senesh, Her Life and Diary by Hannah Senesh	119
NEUSNER, JACOB	Heirs of the Pharisees by Jakob J. Petuchowski	114
PFEFFER, LEO	Review-Essay: In the Pursuit of Justice Self-Incrimination in Jewish Law by Aaron Kirschenbaum	107
RACKMAN, EMANUEL	Review-Essay: From Eulogy to Epitaph Jewish Law in Ancient Israel: Selected Essays, by Haim H. Cohn	369
ROTH, NORMAN	The Columbia History of the World Edited by John A. Garraty & Peter Gay	378
SHASHAR, MICHAEL	Arab Attitudes Toward Israel by Yehoshafat Harkabi	123
SILVER, DANIEL JEREMY	A History of Zionism by Walter Laqueur	381
WEISS-ROSMARIN, TRUDE	Review-Essay: In Praise of Reason Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism, by Herman Cohen	498

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (Act of August 12, 1970, Section 3685, title 39, United States Code). 1. Date of Filing: September 21, 1973. 2. Title of Publication: Judaism. 3. Frequency of Issue: Quarterly. 4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 15 East 84th Street, New York, New York 10028. 5. Location of Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 15 East 84th Street, New York, New York 10028. 6. Names and addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor: Publisher: American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028. Editor: Robert Gordis, 15 East 84th Street, New York, New York 10028. Managing Editor: Ruth B. Waxman, 15 East 84th Street, New York, New York 10028. 7. Owner: American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N.Y. 10028, non-profit, non-stockholding. 8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities: None. 10. For completion by non-profit organizations authorized to mail at special rates: The purpose, function, and non-profit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during preceding 12 months. 11. Extent and nature of circulation. A. Total number of copies (net press run). Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 3,400. Single issue nearest filing date 3,500. B. Paid circulation: 1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales. Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 207. Single issue nearest filing date 89. 2. Mail subscriptions. Average number of copies during preceding 12 months 2,845. Single issue nearest filing date 2,726. C. Total paid circulation. Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 3,052. Single issue nearest filing date 2,933. D. Free distribution (including samples) by mail, carrier or other means. Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 240. Single issue nearest filing date 242. E. Total distribution (sum of C and D). Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 3,294. Single issue nearest filing date 3,136. F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing. Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 35. Single issue nearest filing date 0. G. Sum of E and F—should equal net press run shown in A). Average number of copies each issue during preceding 12 months 3,400. Single issue nearest to filing date 3,600. I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete. Ruth B. Waxman, Managing Editor.

JUDAISM

FAITH and REASON

Essays in Judaism

edited by

Robert Gordis and Ruth B. Waxman

Thirty-six significant articles, written by outstanding scholars and thinkers, and selected from the pages of JUDAISM.

Offering a structural presentation of the fundamental issues and problems of Jewish theology, both historical and contemporary, from the Bible to the post-Holocaust era.

The contributors are: Alexander Altmann, Eliezer Berkovits, Seymour Cain, Jacob Chinitz, Arthur A. Cohen, Jack J. Cohen, Samuel S. Cohon, Samuel H. Dresner, Emil L. Fackenheim, Marvin Fox, Maurice S. Friedman, Robert Gordis, Joseph G. Gumbiner, Jacob Lev Halevi, Monford Harris, Will Herberg, Abraham Joshua Heschel, Avraham Holtz, Simon Kaplan, Samuel E. Karff, Joseph Klausner, Zvi Erich Kurzweil, Jakob J. Petuchowski, Emanuel Rackman, Noah H. Rosenbloom, Richard L. Rubenstein, Zalman M. Schachter, Nochumm J. Schealtiel, Steven S. Schwarzschild, David S. Shapiro, Solomon Simon, Charles W. Steckel, Morris Stockhammer, Paul J. Tillich, Isadore Twersky.

KTAV, N.Y. — 1973

Cloth, \$15.00

xxiii + 388 pages

Order from:

JUDAISM, 15 E. 84th St., N.Y. 10028

— or —

KTAV Pub. House, Inc., 120 E. Broadway, N.Y. 10002